

No. 70 November 1973

Spearhead

10p

BLACK RACIALISM ON RAMPAGE



Nationalist comment

WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news

The war that was inevitable

The breaking out of another Middle Eastern war was inevitable and should cause no surprise. The inevitability of a continued succession of wars in the area was indeed signed and sealed with the Balfour Declaration, endorsed in the Treaty of Sèvres in 1920.

Much will no doubt have happened between this copy going to press and our publication at the beginning of November, so that it is difficult to make commentaries on the war situation, so rapidly can one be overtaken by events. We can only point to those outraged at what is reported to be the Arab initiative for starting the war that the Arabs were merely marching into what is without dispute their own territory, annexed from them after the Six Day War of 1967.

Many have expressed concern that the war will escalate into a super-power conflict. This in fact is a totally naive view of super-

power relationships. The prospect of Russia and the United States, after having been engaged in close *entente* since the time of Roosevelt, now going to war as a result of the current Jew-Arab flare up is quite out of the question. What the super-powers are compelled to do in the Middle East is strike the postures required of them by the demands of global strategy and domestic politics. Soviet global strategy requires that a posture of overt support for the Arabs is maintained in order to preserve Russia's Middle Eastern sphere of influence. Hence her supply of arms to the Arab side. Under cover, meanwhile, there is a close liaison between Tel Aviv and Moscow which was demonstrated by the latter's encouragement to the Arabs to attack in 1967 just at the time when Soviet intelligence knew that conditions were all in favour of the Israelis, and by a Soviet warning to Israel about Arab plans last month. The secret Soviet-Israeli nexus is logical to anyone acquainted with the Jewish origins of the Soviet state and the large Jewish influence still remaining in many echelons of the ruling party in Russia.

America's situation is equally complex. Underlying everything is her total commitment to Zionism inherent in the nature of the forces surrounding the US presidency. However, today she no more than any other major Western power can be immune to the pressures of Arab oil suppliers. Exactly what policy will ensue from this dichotomy of interests is yet to be seen.

The whole Middle Eastern cauldron remains what it has been for many years, the scene of an intricate chess game between numerous powerful interests, few of which are national and many of which are political and commercial. Those who attempt clear cut definitions of what is happening usually have their theories turned upside down later

on by the passage of events. Only one thing is certain: whatever Britain may do in the situation, the British interest will be the very last interest to be considered.

Not for export!

The threatened embargo on oil supplies resulting from the Middle Eastern war has very rightly provoked the comment in some newspapers that the sooner Britain is organised to exploit her oil resources in the North Sea the better.

What is greatly in doubt, however, is whether our current economic philosophy is adequate to ensure that this huge national asset is correctly utilised. We have commented before on the sell-out to foreign interests. This is a policy that can of course be reversed by the will of a future British Government.

What is perhaps more dangerous is the likelihood, envisaged enthusiastically by certain so-called 'expert economists', that North Sea oil will provide Britain with an item for a huge export trade.

In fact, to export large quantities of North Sea oil would be short-sighted in the extreme.

To use the oil for export would simply ensure that the reserves would be exhausted much sooner than need be the case. No oil reserves are without limit, as America's experience has proved. Once a country's self-sufficiency in this vital fuel has been destroyed, that country becomes, like Britain has been up to now, dangerously vulnerable to external pressure.

Short term economic advantage may suggest that we should exploit every avenue of export trade, and this would certainly be to the liking of the powerful private business interests involved.

But this should give way in priority to the demands of **national strategy** — which require that, if we are going to be favoured by nature with this immense asset and the leverage of power which it will give us, we should span out the reserves for our own use alone as long as possible.

Adventures of Larry the Lamb

In recent years Britain has imported many exotic new cultural and religious habits, and opinions differ greatly — depending on what side of the fence you are on — as to whether this is a good or a bad thing.

Larry the lamb, on sale at a sheep market in Kent recently, very nearly came to a grisly end in the pursuance of one of these outlandish customs. Larry was bought by a member of a religious sect who planned what they thought was a very special end for

S P E A R H E A D

No. 70 NOVEMBER 1973

Office: 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, CR0 2QF, Surrey (Tel. 01-684 3730)

Editor: John Tyndall Asst. Editor: Martin Webster

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its Editor and is independent of all political parties and groups.


Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.



LARRY THE LAMB
Saved from a ghastly death

him. He was to be offered up as a sacrificial lamb by being burnt at the stake.

Fortunately for Larry, the police got to hear of the plans to burn him and stepped in to save him. He was quickly moved from his place of captivity to the RSPCA, Southall, where he is pictured on this page having a pleasant life among the other farm animals.

What sort of religious sect was responsible for sentencing Larry to be burnt alive? The newspaper from which we obtained this story declined to mention that small trifle. However, we do have a clue in the fact that the animal ended up at the Southall branch of the RSPCA. One would assume from this that Southall, Middlesex (or thereabouts) is the area in which the police got hold of him. Now since, as everybody knows, Southall is absolutely teeming with Welsh baptists — the whole high street of the town being dominated by shops bearing names such as Jones, Jenkins, Davies, Hughes and Morgan — people with nasty minds might deduce that it was the Welsh who were responsible for planning this quaint ritual. Of course one would not in those circumstances expect the paper to be specific about the origins of the sect concerned. That might encourage people to be anti-Welsh!

Twisting the facts

In another part of this issue an article by the late A. K. Chesterton spotlights the deplorable standards of journalism currently observed by *The Times* — with particular reference to its treatment of the alleged 'Wiryamu massacre'. The same standards have been apparent in *The Times* reporting

on the Northern Ireland troubles.

On October 5th the paper published the findings of an opinion poll on Ulster conducted throughout Britain. The report was headed "Largest section of the electorate would prefer a United Ireland".

In view of the way that the British public as a whole has been misinformed by the mass media about the Irish issue, it would in fact be no surprise had this heading reflected the truth. However, when reading it one found that this was far from the case.

The Times reported the poll as asking members of the public what was the best way of restoring peace in Northern Ireland. The answers were divided into three categories: (a) Total integration of Northern Ireland with Britain; (b) A provincial government responsible to the British Government; (c) Unification with the Republic.

The answers received were: (a) 24 per-cent; (b) 23 per-cent; (c) 34 per-cent. The remainder were 'don't knows'.

As the 34 per-cent in favour of a united Ireland represented the largest single group of these three, *The Times* presumably thought itself justified in heading the report in the way it did.

To any thinking person studying the report, however, it was obvious that, to suit its own convenience, *The Times* had divided into two categories, (a) and (b), what should in fact have been one category representing those who supported the maintenance of the union, albeit in different forms. Had this honest practice been observed the report would have had to admit that the union was supported by a majority of 47 per-cent as against 34 per-cent. In fact taken as a proportion of those who expressed any

definite views on the matter at all those in favour of the union represented 58 per-cent. To say in the face of this fact that "the largest section of the electorate would prefer a united Ireland" is grossly misleading.

Our Editor wrote a letter to *The Times* immediately after publication of the report pointing out these facts. Needless to say, his letter was not published.

Twisting the facts again

Not to be outdone by *The Times* in the art of modern-style reporting is the *Sunday Telegraph*. On October 13th, as everybody well knows, the National Front annual conference was attacked by a left-wing mob organised by Tariq Ali of the International Marxist Group and recruited and transported by the bus-load from all parts of the country.

A police cordon blocked off the entrances to the hall where the conference was being held and this bore the entire brunt of the assault, all NF members being inside the hall taking part in the meeting. The scuffles that ensued were therefore entirely between the left-wing mob and the police. Many pressmen, including a representative of London's main news agency, the Press Association, were present to record exactly what happened.

What then did we read the following day? In the *Sunday Telegraph* the events were covered by a photograph of a group of police in Red Lion Square, the scene of the riot. Down on the pavement beside them were a number of items of clothing found lying about after the melee. The caption to the photograph said: "Police sorting out clothing lost during scuffles with members of the National Front near Conway Hall, London, yesterday when they held their annual conference."

Not a word about the presence of an organised red mob! Only reference to the police and the National Front, with the clear inference that it was NF members who were engaged in clashes with the police.

A report of the same event was made during the afternoon of October 13th by the London Broadcasting Company. This report, as with that of the *Sunday Telegraph*, made no reference at all to the presence of left-wingers or reds; it merely stated that police had clashed with "political extremists" during a rally of the National Front. Listeners were in other words left to assume that the NF were the "political extremists" concerned.

Something is very unwholesome and unclean in Britain's mass media. A virus of subversion and untruth exists which will one day have to be rooted out, and if the feelings of our supporters are anything to go by it should be no surprise if this rooting out is carried through with the utmost energy and at great discomfort to the responsible parties.

GET OUT OF THE COMMON MARKET!

THERE was a battle against the time factor at the Annual General Meeting of the National Front on Saturday October 13th. The Conway Hall, London, had been booked for another meeting at 6.00 p.m. Time was passing and the Chairman was obliged to withdraw the last two of seventeen resolutions due to be put to the meeting.

By the courtesy of the Editor of *Spearhead* I have been enabled to set out below what would have been spoken in regard to Resolution 16.

RESOLUTION 16

RESOLVED – subject only to an urgent contingency – this meeting insists that the first political priority of the National Front must be the withdrawal of Great Britain from the Common Market in the shortest possible time, and that the Directorate should take all practicable steps to that end.

Mr. Chairman and fellow Nationalists:

The Resolution before you is very nearly last on the list. But, believe me, it is not going to be the last in importance. I refer to the Common Market.

Sometimes it is desirable to go back a bit in order to clear the road ahead. During the past year our main effort has been directed to the utmost opposition to the entry of thousands and thousands of Asian immigrants into Great Britain. It has paid off handsomely in terms of increased membership and in other ways too.

There are, however, two aspects to bear in mind: firstly, that the concentration of coloured people is confined to a relatively small number of areas in the United Kingdom – and secondly, and this is important, the repatriation policy of the National Front cannot be made operative so long as our sovereignty has been abandoned to the abominable Common Market. And this applies to no less than seven of our principle objectives; all of which are covered by the Treaty of Rome.

One thing is certain: We can break free if we have the will to do so. It must be remembered there are many precedents of a new government undoing the work of its predecessors. There can be no worry on that score.

So a victory for the National Front will be essential. In that context I disagree with one of my Directorate colleagues whose estimation of the time required for us to come to power is twenty years; yet another

colleague thinks it will require eight years. If either of my friends is right then – in my opinion – the fulfilment of our objects will be unobtainable because twenty years hence there will be nothing to salvage.

Fortunately there is ample evidence to show that the three worn-out old parties are fearful of the growth of the National Front. Each on T.V., the radio and the press media have shown their fear of a National Government coming to power and each fear that a crisis could bring it about – they are the pale pinks, the medium pinks and the dark pinks of Internationalism.

In my opinion, it is doubtful if any relatively young political party – such as ours – has been so fortunate to find itself destined to be the only avenue through which our great country can be freed from the tentacles of the international forces which drove Britain into the Common Market.

There are, of course, the Safeguards people, the Anti-Common Market League and many small organisations whose purpose it is to persuade M.P.s not to vote for our retention in the Common Market and whose propaganda has been most valuable. But these seemingly well-intentioned people forget the M.P.s who rallied when the challenge came last year!! Then there are those who seek to 're-negotiate'. What hope, my friends! But there remains the National Front which stands firm and alone sworn, as a political party, to get us out. Let us put that cause first. The target is clear but the time is short.

I have pleasure in proposing the Resolution.

In the unavoidable absence of Stephen Wilson – the seconder of the Resolution (who has gone to Rome to teach English literature) – Ted Artherton agreed to read his statement.

You have been told bluntly by Frank Clifford it is essential that Britain must be got out of the E.E.C. as quickly as possible. I would like to support him by the following facts:—

1. Food prices started to rise with the decimalisation of our money and have been increasing ever since due to our membership of the E.E.C.
2. In August last the *Daily Telegraph* published the results of a gallop poll – a swing of 20% against the Common Market: 52% against, 32% for and 16% 'don't know'.
3. France now claims that British North Sea oil must become a European possession.
4. The much publicised trash about the advantages of the huge European Market of some 300 million people is already shown to

be nonsense. The imports from Europe into Britain much exceed our exports to Europe which has the effect of increasing our Balance of Payments difficulties.

5. The poaching by French fishing vessels of our territorial waters in the English Channel.

6. The restriction of our steel production by order of the E.E.C.

7. The juggernauts won: Beef prices rise because our beef cattle are exported to Europe.

8. Our judges are now making ready to replace the Common Law of Britain by the Roman law of the E.E.C. when a charged man is guilty until he can prove his innocence!

9. The Commonwealth preferential trading tariffs have been abandoned which has caused great distress to our kith and kin overseas.

10. Britain has been compelled to break her sugar agreement with the Commonwealth.

And so on and on – and what next? With all these and more disastrous happenings I could not do otherwise than to second the Resolution.

READ SPARK

Spark is the National Front paper for students. It is published each university term by the National Front Students' Association. Get *Spark* into your local university, college or school. Copies may be obtained at 2p each or 1p each for quantities of 50 or over, with a charge of 20p in the £ to cover postage, from: NFSA, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, CRO 2QF.

BUY A TIE!

National Front ties now available. Red, white and blue colour scheme with NF emblem.

Price: one only £1.50 (inc. VAT)
10–19 £1.40 each (inc. VAT)
20 or over £1.30 each (inc. VAT)

Apply to: Mr. R. Davison, 59 Crowther Rd., Wolverhampton, Staffs.

Name

Address

SPEARHEAD JULY ISSUE

We need copies of our July issue, which several readers have requested but which is out of stock. Should any of our bulk purchasers have spare copies of ten or more in unsoiled and uncreased condition we will pay for the return of these at original price plus price of postage for return to: 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, CRO 2QF.

CHARITIES nowadays are wearing a new look – in some cases political and modishly left. Hurrying to keep up with the fashion, Oxfam and Christian Aid jointly launched, in March of this year, a new monthly, *The New Internationalist*. Described by the Church of England Newspaper as “wholly independent and radical” its declared aim is “to involve as many people as possible in the campaign for world development.” Leslie Kirkley, Director of Oxfam, says “World poverty and the mass misery it causes will never be wiped out by charity alone. Only political, social and economic change can ever solve this problem.”

The cover of its first issue bore a close-up of the face of President Kaunda of Zambia caught in a moment of oratorical passion with forefinger wagging. “What we are now witnessing here is the beginning of a racial holocaust” quotes the large-print caption – referring, of course, to Rhodesia. In an interview with David Martin, Kaunda says the British Government should have used troops to stop UDI. Its failure to do so means that Britain “will take a big share of the blame” for the coming “racial holocaust.” Any economic difficulties the Rhodesian situation is causing Zambia “will be placed squarely on the shoulders of the British Government . . . we will be submitting details of our costs . . .” The interview occupies six pages with a picture of Kaunda in a different pose on each page.

A letter page bears thirteen letters of congratulation. Dr. Potter of the World Council of Churches hopes the editor will give publicity to “political activists in Europe and North America.” Peter Hain hopes the magazine will be “supported by all those seeking an end to international exploitation.” Bishop Huddleston, Shirley Williams and Des Wilson join the chorus. The second issue in April had letters – congratulatory – from Labour MPs Judd, Hart and Prentice, the director of the African National Congress, Bishop Winter lately deported from South West Africa and Kurt Waldheim.

This same issue had a full-page editorial entitled ‘The Alliance of Shame’ attacking Portugal and the proposed anniversary celebrations. Caetano is reviled as a “dictator” because he rules over a one-party state: Kaunda does the same but he’s called a “humanist”! Portuguese colonial rule “defies every declaration of human rights that has ever been issued.” The African workers’ condition is “little short of slavery.” They live in compounds “surrounded by barbed wire, guard dogs and machine gun turrets” like “Nazi concentration camps.” The writer goes on to justify the terrorist movements – he calls them the “national independence army” – and says the justice of their cause “has now been accepted, after independent inquiries, by both the World Council of Churches and the United Nations.” (Emphasis supplied – Ed.). Referring to Caetano’s proposed state visit to this country, the writer urges readers to voice their disapproval. In view of the demonstrations that in fact took place on the visit the final paragraph is interesting: “Several British organisations are helping to organise peaceful protests and letter-writing campaigns to the press, politicians and embassies in protest at the celebration of the Anglo-Portuguese Alliance. Details of these campaigns are available from the *New Internationalist*.” (Emphasis supplied – Ed.).

WHEN IS A CHARITY POLITICAL?

Inside the first and later issues of the magazine appears a detachable subscription form. It bears a picture of a dozen or so British policemen lined shoulder to shoulder across a road. A child of three or four moves towards them, back to the camera. The caption reads: “The odds are against us.” Turn over and on the reverse in large type we are told: “With help from you we’ll beat the odds.” A letter of protest drawing attention to this subscription form appeared in the *Anglican Church Times* of 30 March, 1973. As it provoked a revealing correspondence it is worth quoting.

CHRISTIAN AID AND OXFAM: A POLITICAL NEW LOOK?

Reprinted in abridged form with acknowledgements to EAST-WEST DIGEST, 139 Petersham Road, Richmond, Surrey.

After describing the form it said: “It seems to me unhelpful to imply – as this clearly does – that the forces of law and order in this country have no other purpose than to defend the interests of the wicked-rich-capitalist-West against the helplessly poor Third World. The sole concern of our police is that the rights of persons and property should be protected. Unlike the police in Communist countries they have no political role. It is only Marxists who see the British bobby as the strong-arm of the ruling-class. If Christian Aid and Oxfam now feel that their work of relief to the poor countries obliges them to smear the British police force in such a mindless way, would it not be better if they made a plain statement of their political convictions? Those who disagree could then donate their money to other causes.”

The correspondence that followed was chiefly notable for the eagerness of Christian Aid officials to disclaim any responsibility for views expressed in the magazine. Alan Booth, the director of Christian Aid, wrote: “Christian Aid does not control the editorial or promotional policy of the *New Internationalist*. It has made clear all along its hopes that the *N.I.* would contribute to a lively and many-coloured debate. Were it, in fact, to become the house magazine of a particular political sect, it would betray its origin and, I believe, totally prejudice its missionary value.”

Hugh C. Samsom, another official of Christian Aid wrote: “It must be repeated that, when Christian Aid and Oxfam agreed to give limited backing to the *New Internationalist*, they also agreed to give its editor enough independence to produce and promote without constant interference from the sponsors. Neither organisation considered it necessary to amend his proposed subscription form; but, like the magazine itself, it should not be taken as a statement of Christian Aid or Oxfam policy.”

No letter appeared from Oxfam but doubtless they would say the same as Christian Aid. It seems very strange that two such charities should invest donations in a new magazine yet exercise no effective control over what goes into it. There seems to be more than a hint of irresponsibility here. And if the editorial staff is as free as Mr. Booth says, what is to prevent the magazine becoming – in his own words – “the house magazine of a particular political sect”? What safeguards can Mr. Booth offer his donors?

“A COMMUNIST TRACT”

The launching of the new magazine also sparked off controversy in the Christian Aid monthly newsheet *Christian Aid News*. In the February 1973 issue appeared a letter from the Rev. G. Francis Dow of Helston, Cornwall. “The original *raison d’être* of both societies was to succour, in the Name of Christ, the needy and afflicted wherever and whenever disaster struck

(whether man-made or natural calamities). Therefore neither society is justified in misusing resources (generously given by the charitably disposed), for political propaganda and ‘left-wing’, ‘Third World’ education (or agitation) purposes.” This produced a spate of letters for and against continuing for some months. One letters’ page was headlined “A Communist Tract?” – that was a Christian Aid collector’s terse description of the new magazine.

The dust has temporarily settled on the controversy without any of the main charges being answered. Have Christian Aid and Oxfam become political pressure groups? Have they betrayed their origins? Have they been hi-jacked by the political left? That changes have taken place is undeniable. How radical they are is what is at issue.

Both charities were founded towards the end of the Second World War to help refugees and to get food through the allied blockade to Europe’s hungry. Oxfam originated in the concern of a group of citizens of Oxford whereas Christian Aid was the offspring of the British Council of Churches. In those days it was soup, blankets and warm clothes – a simple response to the misery of those whom war had dispossessed.

In 1960 came the turning point. This was the year the United Nations launched its Freedom From Hunger Campaign. Oxfam supported many of the Campaign’s overseas projects and the focus of relief work began to shift from Europe and the Middle East to India, Africa and – later on – to Latin America.

NATIONAL FRONT FILM UNIT

Would all those interested and owning still or movie equipment (8mm or 16mm, Sound/Silent), please contact:
N.F.F.U. (Central Focus Films),
20 South Road,
Edmonton, London N9 7JH

STUDENTS!

All NF members who are full-time or part-time students at schools, colleges or universities and who have not yet registered with the National Front Students’ Association, are asked to do so immediately. No extra subscription is required.

Letters to:

National Secretary, N.F.S.A.,
50 Pawsons Road,
Croydon, Surrey, CRO 2QF

HISTORY affords us many examples of a cyclic struggle between the 'Haves' and the 'Have nots' — between those who possess economic and social power and intend to keep it and those who lack this power but desire to gain it.

From the ancient Greek City States through to Allende's rule in Chile we have a repeated pattern unfolded before us.

The differences in ability, drive and effort exhibited by individuals within society leads to social differentiation, to power, wealth and influence being gradually concentrated into the hands of a few. The few become an oligarchy, using political means to maintain their position in, and over, the community at large.

An oligarchic state has a certain internal stability — as long as there is external stability and no diminution of overall wealth. Very often the ruling class will trust no one man to hold supreme authority in case he threatens their collective economic power base by confiscation. Usually, they evolve an 'Athenian' or Parliamentary system of formal democracy. Such governments possess a high degree of honest administration — as it is difficult to bribe the rich. There is also a tradition of public service amongst the oligarchy's families — as after all the State is the 'family firm' and its efficient running guarantees the rulers' wealth.

Trouble comes when trade, financial or other economic problems lead to a cut back in overall real wealth. **Everyone** wants to maintain the same size slice of a shrinking national cake.

Social conflict emerges into the open with strikes, riots, lock-outs and financial speculation, worsening rises in prices, lessening the availability of goods and increasing monetary inflation.

The old conservative oligarchy finds the situation becoming unmanageable. Control slips gradually from its grasp and the stage is set for violent change.

It can come in two ways.

POPULIST DEMAGOGUE

On the one hand there is the populist demagogue who harangues the masses and whips them into a froth of blind hatred against the rich who are blamed for all the ills of society. The populist appeals to 'the masses', to the 'equality of man', to the drastic redistribution of wealth and above all to the fact that he is the liberator of the downtrodden and poor, who will punish the wicked oligarchy.

On the other hand there is the gifted individualist, who springs from the ranks of the oligarchy and takes its power to be a natural fact of life — the result of "fruitful inequality". He comes forth as the leader, who proclaims that the rising tide of poverty and misery results from the activity of

MICHAEL LOBB

BREAKING HISTORY'S VICIOUS CIRCLE

"agitators" and "anarchists". He proclaims too that a return to "law and order" is a prerequisite of rebuilding general prosperity. He advocates a restoration of "traditional values", of "discipline", "authority" and "patriotism" of the flag waving variety.

Each is right and both are wrong. Between them they succeed in solving nothing and shedding much blood in the process.

The reader will see that my two stereotypes represent the orthodox political division of Left and Right. In modern times these two sets of attitudes have crystallised as "socialism" and authoritarianism of the reactionary type.

Amongst the 'socialists' are pragmatic old style populists like Peron, Social Democrats like the Labour Party and Communists like Lenin and his successors. Amongst the reactionaries are rulers like Salazar and Franco.

Let us examine the progress of each type of revolutionary. If the Right takes power it does so backed by the armed forces. After the initial struggles culminating in the suppression of the Left, there is a general belt-tightening all round. The oligarchy accept the leader at the cost of their parliamentarism — as it seems the only way in which they can remain the oligarchy. They cut their losses to survive as a group.

Gradually as economic conditions improve — and the leader grows old — the oligarchy begin once more to work for a balance of power between the rich. This process continues after the leader dies and eventually as less able people succeed him the oligarchy reassert their spread of power within their own class by restoring formal democracy. We return to square one.

Should the Left seize power, they do so by promising power and riches to their followers. Once the liberator is in command, his people come to cash in the promises that they have been given. The liberator taxes, confiscates and plunders the rich. Prices are frozen and wages are increased across the board. As a consequence there is no accumulation of capital for re-investment. Businessmen, manufacturers, merchants and artisans contract rather than expand their commercial efforts.

Production drops and prices rise. Real wages fall as commodities become scarce. Groups of workers seize factories and farms — to hold fast their own slipping living

standards amid general decline and growing chaos.

People start to grumble. The liberator seems not to be such a liberator as everyone thought. The liberator is in a tricky position. Below him, other potential liberators claim that he is not going fast enough or far enough. Around him, his cronies are helping themselves to administrative posts. Unlike the oligarchy — being neither well off nor having experience or a tradition of public service — the new rulers are bribable and inefficient. There is corruption and bureaucratic squandering of public funds.

The liberator is in a fix. There is one way out, taken by him (or by his successor if he is too weak) . . .

He came to power on the bayonets of the people. Now the bayonets are turned against the people.

The liberator proclaims that the economic collapse is the fault of 'saboteurs'. Scapegoats are to hand in every direction: survivors of the oligarchy, who could be plotting counter-revolution; foreign powers, who could be plotting aggression or 'far' left "wreckers", grabbing factories and farms and running them on syndicalist lines.

In order to 'protect the revolution', democracy is gutted. Opposition becomes treason. The police and the revolutionary armed forces are given more powers. The state takes more and more direct control of industry.

Gradually the new rulers of the socialist police state settle down to the business of running the state — at a profit to themselves.

In three generations their descendants are the new oligarchy. We're back to square one again.

UNDERSTAND HISTORY

This then is history's Misery-Go-Round. We need to clearly understand the processes of history in order to overcome them or otherwise we will be swept along by them. Neither Left nor Right have the complete monopoly of truth or falsehood.

People are not equal and society will always be hierarchical but that hierarchy must be open to everyone on merit and those who have special privileges in society also have special duties to it. These duties will

only be enforced if all who hold power do so as representatives of the national community, subject to democratic control and accountability to the people.

Oligarchies tend to find more in common with other oligarchies in other countries than with their own people. Their patriotism is only the patriotism of profit. If trade doesn't follow the flag — then they hoist down the flag! For private motives, dressed up as public moralising, they will introduce immigrant labour to swell the labour pool and keep wages down — regardless of the ethnic/social cost to the nation. They will sell out national independence for a bigger market for financial speculation on an international level.

They will shut down factories and shops and throw thousands out of work careless of the consequences in hardship and suffering.


At the other extreme, socialism results in stagnation and inefficiency, because bureaucratic controls stifle all innovation and exceptional skills.

There will always be differences in wealth and possessions. Some people have greater abilities, work harder or save more. Unless all effort is crushed under socialist ineptitude, differences of wealth must occur.

Private enterprise gives greater scope to positive abilities but also to negative ones. There are certain things which cannot be left in private hands if the community is to control its own destiny and to prosper. We do not allow private enterprise tax collection — as did the Romans. We can no longer allow private enterprise banking. The power to regulate the money supply through credit creation is the prerogative of the state. By and through public ownership of financial powers, the state is enabled to provide a publicly-controlled framework within which private enterprise can work.

As private ownership is checked from above in this way — for the national interest of the whole community so, too, workers' co-partnership through equal control by capital and labour in every industry ensures that a check is kept upon the wealthy from below. No economy operating under co-partnership would allow the export of capital abroad or the importation of immigrant labour. The worker directors, democratically elected from below, would never be allowed to support such attacks upon workers' interests! In this way, the competition between the interests of capital and labour would strengthen national identity, independence and self-reliance.

An awareness of social history coupled with a political programme designed to benefit the nation, through principled adherence to democratic government and workers' co-partnership, gives us a chance to break out of the short circuit of old Left/Right rivalry and to build a better future by a determination not to fall into the traps of the past. It's up to us to grasp this bright opportunity.



"TED DID TELL US NOT TO EXPECT THE BENEFITS OF JOINING THE COMMON MARKET TO FILTER THROUGH TILL THE NINETEEN EIGHTIES"

Things you should read

A great wealth of literature is now available supporting in the main part the views expressed in Spearhead. Below we list some of the most important examples. Except where stated, these can be obtained from Nationalist Books, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon CRO 2QF. 15p in the £ should be sent with each order to cover postage.

THE MONEY MANUFACTURERS (National Front policy pamphlet) 10p

An exposure of the present financial system and proposals for its reform.

THE CASE FOR ECONOMIC NATIONALISM (National Front policy pamphlet) 10p

An attack on the Manchester school of internationalist economics and an argument for protection and national self-sufficiency.

SIX PRINCIPLES OF BRITISH NATIONALISM (by John Tyndall) 15p

An independent booklet written before the formation of the National Front but closely in line with its outlook.

THE NEW UNHAPPY LORDS (by A. K. Chesterton) Paperback £1

Masterly exposure of the politico-financial forces that have destroyed the British Empire and undermined British world power, while working for the general elimination of national sovereignty everywhere.

WORLD REVOLUTION (by Nesta Webster) Paperback £1.80

Perhaps the best ever documented history of the political left and its conspiratorial origins.

SUICIDE OF THE WEST (by James Burnham) £3.00

A devastating demolition of the liberal-left and its main arguments by a one-time left-wing author who woke up.

THE SPECIOUS ORIGINS OF LIBERALISM (by Anthony Ludovici) £1.50

Another clinical analysis of liberal values and viewpoints in which their futility is well exposed.

RACIAL INTEGRATION (by H. B. Isherwood) Card 40p; Hard 75p

A testimony to the impracticality of the multi-racial society.

BIOLOGY OF THE RACE PROBLEM (by Professor W. C. George) 15p

One of the best scientific exposures of the myth of racial equality.

THE COLLAPSE OF BRITISH POWER (by Correlli Barnett) £5.

Devastating indictment of liberalism and its role in bringing about Britain's 20th century decline, political, industrial and military. Essential reading for anyone who seeks to reverse British trends in coming decades.

NATIONALISM AND THE YOUNG IDEALIST

THE ORTHODOX RIGHT likes to be identified as 'realistic' and 'down to earth'. It has long favoured pragmatism as its guiding principle in political affairs and takes pains to assure all and sundry that however reckless others may be it has its feet firmly planted on the ground. You can rely on the good old plodding orthodox right. Although this 'hard headed realism' may give comfort to those who think that the political left is living in cloud cuckoo land, what in effect this political tradition does it to foster a sort and anti-belief.

The orthodox right distrusts someone who believes in something enough to make a fuss about it ("Don't rock the boat old chap, we're all jolly sailors together"). Its reply to the ideals of the left is too often to banish ideals altogether — an attitude of "be practical and everything will be all right". Lurking behind this facade of 'realism' lies the no-principle, nothing-is-too-valuable-to-sacrifice philosophy becoming more evident in recent years — one feels that the motto of the modern orthodox right should be "Play safe — don't believe in anything!"

At a fairly youthful age the thoughtful student looks around for principles on which to build his life and if he has any interest in politics he cannot fail to come across a varied selection of leftist propaganda. Here he will find a whole range of 'ideals' to fight for together with a potted version of what is wrong with the world. If then he goes on to consult the orthodox right's policies the only consistent theme to emerge will be "Make money and don't bother too much about the rest." Given these alternatives, the orthodox right is a virtual non-starter, and our young thinker may be excused if he draws the conclusion that right-wing politics is a form of organised cynicism.

It seems clear to me that the only way to combat leftist ideology is not to espouse an anti-belief policy but to put forward an alternative set of beliefs to be defended as passionately as those of the left. Nationalism provides this alternative ideology and in so doing provides also a home for the young idealist. The orthodox right's 'practical politics' works on the assumption that nothing of great value is in danger of destruction in British politics today — everything is basically normal, so a bit of tinkering here, a spot of compromise there, and everything will be O.K. In other words, there is no need to get excited; just keep plodding

and above all "be practical!" The radical right on the other hand is saying that the whole concept of Britain as we now know it is under attack, that we must act now or see our country virtually disappear as anything but a geographical entity; that there is something radically defective in the international financial system; that behind the media illusion of capitalist-communist antagonism is the united drive towards bigger political units and eventually world government. We are saying "Everything in the garden is not beautiful — far from things being normal this is an era of momentous changes for the worse, and it's time we stood up and defended Britain before it's too late."

"PRACTICAL POLITICS"

'Practical politics' is just about defensible in times of 'business as usual', but this is a time of ideological conflict to determine whether nations as such will survive or whether the internationalists and financiers shall win the day. Playing at practical politics will only take us with the tide towards internationalism; our task is to turn that tide, not to ride with it; and this will take a determined stand by idealists, people who are convinced they are right and are prepared to do something about it. The concept of radical change has hardly ever been grasped by the 'practical' orthodox right and it is for this reason that in a time when we need to reverse the trend of decades, to bring about radical change, the 'practical' man is impotent.

Today the disciples of anti-belief can only aid the left, for they provide no alternative philosophy; and are not these people more likely to be persuaded that it is 'practical' to go with the tide? (Particularly with the banker in the background making reassuring remarks.) The nationalist must be an idealist: not a mindless dreamer but one who bases his politics on ideals, one who believes in something rather than being satisfied with anti-belief.

I have seen in the Tory party how the young and the enthusiastic have been left politically inactive — tied up in the irrelevancies of tramps' balls and midnight rambles (the mind boggles!) whilst the elders of the party, adopting the policies of failure, sit condescendingly on high, thinking "Such youthful exuberance — they'll grow out of

it." But then some Young Tories seem to like being under the thumb. In a letter to the *Daily Telegraph* some months ago a group of leading Y.C.'s wrote "Perhaps some of the sentiments expressed by Y.C. officers seem to you too 'wishy-washy' or idealistic. Well, we are sure that realism and hard-headedness will come to us in time." How can anyone be too idealistic in such a party of broken promises and unprincipled betrayals. It is not for the idealist to be apologising but the 'hard-headed realists' who would sell out their country rather than take an 'idealistic' stand. Instead of grovelling in front of the Tory Establishment the young should be putting a rocket up its backside.

YOUTHFUL ENTHUSIASM

In sharp contrast to the situation within the Tory Party, there are many young officials and candidates in the N.F., people who are not held down but are judged according to their ability. It is recognised that young people have a big part to play because their youthful enthusiasm is just what is needed in a party of idealists. This new generation of nationalists are helping to put forward the ideas that are too radical for the Establishment to discuss rationally. They are also helping to expose that technique whereby a politician messes up a situation and then tells us we have to be 'realistic' and accept it (e.g. the multi-racial areas' problems at a time of continued immigration).

As internationalist propaganda increases in our schools and universities, more and more will the young nationalist be the rebel, the one who has not blindly accepted what he has been taught. He will be the questioner, the causer of embarrassment to Establishment teachers who cannot answer his queries. More frequently will he be the outcast, the one who has shunned acceptance in academic circles to side with the British people — the idealist rather than the pragmatist. It will take initiative and disregard for self-interest to question the desirability of the multi-racial society, to ask why no one shows the link between international finance and communism — in short to strike at the heart of Establishment thinking. To do this the young thinker cannot be a 'practical' person. Certainly his ideas must be capable of being put into practice, but the nationalist is 'impractical' in the old right-wing sense because he dares to take on vested interests in this country simply because he is right. The 'practical' man would sit back and do nothing. At all times the young idealist must be welcomed by the N.F. as we build a radical party and destroy the myth that the only alternative to the philosophies of the left are self-interest and organised cynicism. Without him we may yet be persuaded of the realism of total surrender.

TREACHERY AND THE TURBAN

THE OTHER SIDE OF
INDIA'S WAR RECORD

AN ARGUMENT occasionally used by liberal-thinking people in defence of Asian immigration into this country is: "What about the Indians who fought for us in the last war?"

Whilst it is freely acknowledged that Indians, amongst others, did fight with the British Forces and, no doubt, did produce some fine soldiers, it is the purpose of this brief article to demolish the myth that Britain owes some kind of debt to India for "services rendered" in the Second World War.

It can be shown, with an account of historical fact that cannot be challenged, that while India did give some service to the British war effort, at the same time she gave service, in the form of renegade armies, to both Japan and Germany.

Exactly how much help (or hinderance) these armies were to the Axis powers shall later be seen.

In the story of the treason preached and practised by many Indians the prominent figure was a one-time Mayor of Calcutta by the name of Bose.

BOSE THE TRAITOR

Subhas Chandra Bose had been a Cambridge university student in 1927, after which he returned to India to become a fanatical anti-British mob-orator devoting his efforts to creating anarchy and civil unrest. To these ends he joined the Indian National Congress Party, becoming General Secretary in 1927. By 1938 Bose was President of the Congress and he rivalled Ghandi's non-violent leadership for Indian independence. He had gotten himself interned by the British authorities in 1940 for sedition.

Released after a hunger strike in 1941, Bose made his way to war-time Germany with grandiose plans for the "liberation" of India. Hitler and Mussolini were not impressed, however, and so with continuous Japanese victories in South-East Asia, Bose decided to return to his Eastern homeland and try to persuade the Japanese to proclaim

his cause of Indian freedom. He was not unsuccessful.

JAPAN

By the time Bose arrived in Tokyo (May 1943) for discussions with high-ranking officials much had happened in the South-Eastern theatre of war. Japan's forces had advanced, with speed and irresistible force, to cut off, surround, and capture vast numbers of American, British and Indian troops. In Bose's absence, an attempt to recruit personnel for Japan's forces had met with startling success; of the 65,000 Indian P.O.W.'s in Malaya and Singapore over 25,000 enlisted, together with thousands of



Bose in Nazi Germany

Indian civilians, to form what was to become the Azad Hind Fauji, or Indian Nationalist Army.

Hence the years of plotting, infiltration and subversion by the myriad of Indian secret societies had been rewarded: thousands of soldiers had now betrayed their superior officers and broken the pledge to the British Crown.

Bose was made Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Nationalist Army in August 1943, and whilst it was undergoing battle-training he formulated his designs for a Free India within the 'Co-prosperity Sphere' set up by Japan.

In action, the I.N.A. was used to the best advantage when came the drive towards

India, where the renegade soldiers were ready-made infiltrators in the campaign to undermine the loyalty of Indian soldiers to their British officers in a style reminiscent of the Indian Mutiny, almost a century before. On the field of battle, I.N.A. troops were to prove themselves no less efficient than their Japanese comrades in the arts of pillaging, looting and bayonetting wounded prisoners.

GERMANY

Meanwhile in Europe Germany had decided to utilise the large new resources of man-power at her disposal. Amongst the captured armies of over a dozen nations were the Indian contingents of the British Army, taken prisoner mainly in the Western Desert.

To these Indians, Subhas Bose, on one of his frequent trips between Berlin and Tokyo, made the same appeal to fight for a free and independent India. Eventually, a force some 2,000 strong was organised by the Germans into the "Legion Indien", which was never committed to action, but performed mundane construction work and patrol duties.

The "Legion Indien" never gained much respect from the Germans — especially Hitler who regarded it as a joke. The Indians he said, were fit only "to turn prayer wheels". When stationed in the Netherlands, the "Legion Indien" had to be protected by German regulars from a local population, hostile that the Indians had bought up the town's milk supply with their ration-cards.

DEFEAT AND CONCLUSION

1944-5 brought defeat for the Axis powers in Europe and in Asia. The Normandy Landings had opened up a new front and the useless little "Legion Indien" was swallowed up by the Allied advance across northern France. In South-East Asia, Japan had retreated on all fronts, despite the desperate counter-attacks into which the I.N.A. was thrown. The I.N.A. was by now a very disorganised force, with morale at a low ebb and many desertions.

As the war drew to a close, Bose, still the intrepid "freedom-fighter", made plans to fly to Manchuria and surrender to the Russians rather than the British. However, on the flight via Tokyo the plane crashed and Subhas Chandra Bose died as a result of wounds in August 1945.

In retrospect, it can be seen that the "Legion Indien" did not justify itself in terms of performance, for all the time, effort and resources devoted to it. On the other hand, the Indian Nationalist Army made an undoubted contribution to the Japanese war effort. Whatever the excuse, idealistic or materialistic, the men of India's renegade armies had betrayed the British Crown in an extreme and blatant manner.

ASIANS: THE GREAT DECEPTION

RECENT CANVASSING has shown that some people still believe that Britain was legally obliged to admit the Uganda Asians. The campaign of mendacity and deception fostered by the Heath Government is here exposed by quotations selected from *Hansard* and various Press sources and is presented in this format for the possible use of fellow members.

Amin's ultimatum, carefully timed to synchronise with the Parliamentary recess arrived in early August, 1972. Great play was made in the press about our "pledge" to the Uganda Asians and about our "obligations" to holders of British passports. Mr. Heath allowed Parliament to recess! On the 16th August, Enoch Powell, speaking in Wolverhampton, denounced the "sedulously fostered untruths" suggesting Britain had a special obligation to Uganda Asians who were holders of British passports. His speech was more or less ignored by the Government, no doubt in the hope that the sheer weight of media who were pushing the "passport obligation" line would smother Mr. Powell's comments.

THE "CAT AMONG THE PIGEONS"

Nine days later the *Daily Express* put the "cat among the pigeons." It carried a front page article by Chapman Pincher, banner-headlined "NO NEED TO LET THEM IN." Mr. Pincher had followed-up Mr. Powell's claim and reported thus:-

"The Foreign Office, after prolonged discussions with its lawyers, admitted to me that:-

1. Their passports are different from those of ordinary UK citizens in Britain. So much so that the Asians are officially described as 'UK passport holders without right of abode here.'
2. Under the law of this country these passport holders may be refused admission, and they have no right to demand it. But the Government has the power to admit them 'subject to conditions'. This means that the Government could legally bar all the Asians indefinitely or at least reduce the flow to a trickle.
3. The Government however, is taking the view that it has a 'duty under international law' to allow the

Asians in. The Foreign Office is unable to say how this particular law arose except that it has arisen 'through custom'."

"INTERNATIONAL LAW"

The *Daily Express* exposé appeared on Friday, 25th August, and the lie about "passport obligations" was thus well and truly nailed. The Government had to invent another "obligation" and it came up with international law. That very evening the Attorney-General, Sir Peter Rawlinson, appeared on television to "put the Government's case." He announced that although our municipal law specifically denied these Asians any right of abode in the United Kingdom, nevertheless our "obligations" under international law were such that we had to accept them into Britain. This claim by Rawlinson was later described by fellow Queen's Counsel, Mr. Ronald Bell, MP, as "moonshine."

About a week later Sir Alec was brought into the act. He appeared on 'the box' to explain away some contradictions that had been exposed in the Press. Earlier in the year, the Governments of Holland and France had expressed anxiety at the possibility of masses of Asians from East Africa flooding into their countries after Britain was bulldozed into the EEC. The British Government had informed them that their fears were groundless, that these people had no right of abode in the UK. Douglas-Home tried to tell us that those who now tried to draw comparisons between this and the present Uganda situation were confusing the issue and were quite mistaken. He looked very ill at ease, as well he might.

Shortly after this, Mr. Enoch Powell, speaking at Ramsgate, referred to this very subject. He explained that the definition of "nationals" which the Government had negotiated with the European Economic Community and which was embodied in the treaty signed at Brussels in January 1972, plainly and indisputably excluded the Uganda Asians. And, as if to add insult to injury, the Government selected the actual minister who had negotiated that declaration, Mr. Rippon, to go and eat humble pie in Uganda. Mr. Powell continued, "The Attorney-General's dictum about international law has nothing to do with this

case, and he must know it."

IN THE BACKGROUND

All this time Mr. Heath had remained discreetly in the background. Leaving his henchmen to handle the brainwashing, he sailed about on his boat for a time, flew to Munich for four days to watch the Olympic Games, and flew off to Japan for a four-day official visit. Not one word had he uttered on the situation to the British electorate of which as Prime Minister he is also prime public servant. Not one word to the people who pay his salary! Later on, perhaps when he considered that the public had been well conditioned, he permitted himself a brief mention whilst speaking in Manchester and praised the British people for displaying their fine and noble ideals.

On Saturday, 16th September, the Monday Club held a rally at the Central Hall, Westminster, which attracted about 2000 people including a great many National Front members. Mr. Ronald Bell carefully explained the passport peculiarities, established that no pledge had ever been given, that there was no obligation under international law. Readers of *Spearhead* who were present that Saturday afternoon will recall the mood of the assembly. Had the head of Edward Heath been brought in on a salver, the spontaneous rejoicing would have been so fervent that the jubulations expressed when news arrived of the Relief of Mafeking would have paled into insignificance by comparison.

TORY PARTY CONFERENCE

In October 1972 the Tory conference opened in Blackpool. Readers will recall that a recent issue of *Spearhead* featured an article disclosing an attempt to 'bug' Enoch Powell's seat and the infiltration into the hall of a contingent of Young Conservatives to support Robert Carr. At the conference Mr. Carr made a vehement attack on Mr. Powell, who had stornly disputed Lord Hailsham's claim that Britain had "obligations" to the Asians under international law. The Lord Chancellor had by this time entered the act to back up the Attorney-General. The television newsreel showed a large banner in the background bearing the slogan "A promise kept" and at the microphone Mr. Robert Carr. Carr had clearly worked himself up into a vehement and pontifical pitch. With spray issuing from his mouth he thundered at Mr. Powell for "attacking" Lord Hailsham and passionately declared that "we had given our word", that we "did it", meant to do it, and did it "deliberately."

Conveniently forgotten were the pledges given to the British electorate by Mr. Heath in letters written by him in early 1970 and contained in the election manifesto. The Heath letters stated that future immigrants would only be allowed where

they were needed for a specific job, in a specific place for a specific time, and that a Conservative government would have the power to prevent further immigrants from settling in any area where the pressure on social services was thought to be too great. The election manifesto stated: "... But for the future, work permits will not carry the right of permanent settlement for the holder or his dependants. Such permits as are issued will be limited to a specific job in a specific area for a fixed period, normally twelve months. There will of course be no restrictions on travel. These policies mean that future immigration will be allowed in strictly defined special cases. **There will be no further large-scale permanent immigration.**" (Emphasis added).

As far as the Government was concerned, election pledges which brought them into power could be violated in favour of Asians who have never contributed one single farthing to the British economy and whose ethnic, cultural, religious and historical ties all lie in the Indian sub-continent.

Although Heath had stated quite clearly in his letters that immigrants would be prevented from settling in areas where the social services were under too great a pressure, we witnessed the remarkable situation of Leicester City Corporation inserting advertisements in Kampala newspapers pleading with the Asians not to go to Leicester; and Sir Charles Cunningham, head of the Uganda Resettlement Board publicly stating that the Government could only advise them not to go to overburdened areas but had no power to prevent them! For brass-necked effrontery the Heath-Carr-Home trio certainly takes some beating.

NO PLEDGE!

The televised section of Mr. Carr's speech that I saw did not reveal the identity of whoever was supposed to have given this "pledge". Nauseated by the Home Secretary's performance, I wrote him a very strong letter on the 12th October requesting accurate and specific information with full *Hansard* references. No reply was forthcoming so I then wrote to my own MP (a Heathman if ever there was one) requesting the same information. He replied that the "pledge" had been given by Mr. James Callaghan when he was Home Secretary and quoted *Hansard*, 27/28th February, 1968, columns 1499-1501. "I was asked what we would do about a man who was thrown out of work and ejected from the country. We shall have to take him. We cannot do anything else in these circumstances."

I wrote back to say that the quotation from *Hansard* was not a pledge but merely an expression of opinion. That the law of the land clearly and explicitly directs that statements made in either House during the passage of a Bill must be disregarded, that the law must be interpreted only from the

wording of the Act as it finally appears on the Statute Book.

My MP replied that what I had written was correct, but that the Asians in East Africa would have heard what Mr. Callaghan had said and they would think that his statement carried legal weight. I refrained from telling him what he surely knows, that for centuries Britons have been told that: **ignorance of the law is no excuse!**

"REFUGEES"

From the start of the Amin-ultimatum the media had been playing up the "refugee" theme. This was an attempt to play on the sympathies of the man in the street by presenting the situation as though it were comparable say with the plight of refugees from Hungary in 1956, whose homeland had been overrun and who had nowhere else to go. Ignored, the fact that their ancestral homeland is India, Pakistan or Bangladesh. Ignored, the confines of this overcrowded island. Ignored, the seething anger of the British people, which manifested itself in protest marches, petitions, letters to Members of Parliament and to the Press.

GOVERNMENT'S "CASE" CRUMBLES

After Parliament reassembled the Government's "case" began to crumble. The first crack appeared on the 23rd October. *Hansard* of that date reports a reply by Sir Alec Douglas-Home which reads as follows:—

"... At the time of the independence of the former British East African Territories, no specific undertakings were made either about the entry of East African Asians as such to the United Kingdom or about retention of citizenship. But this does not affect the obligation to admit nationals in certain circumstances if they are expelled and have nowhere else to go. The grant of a United Kingdom passport does not in itself confer a citizenship or other status on the holder. It recognises the status which he already has and is accepted internationally for travel purposes." (*Hansard*, Vol. 843, col. 172).

The significance of this reply lies in the fact that it appeared under "Written Answers." This was no off-the-cuff, spur of the moment answer. The Foreign Office had plenty of time to phrase their reply. The reference to "obligations to admit" was a clumsy attempt to bolster-up the international law pretence, a clutching at straws. And note the impudent use of the word "nationals", after excluding the Asians from this category specifically for the treaty signed in Brussels. Note also the inference "nowhere else to go". No mention of that huge country — India!

For good measure let us pursue another entry from *Hansard*, this time by Mr. Duncan Sandys.

"It is said that as Colonial Secretary I gave an undertaking to the Asians in Kenya that they would always have the right to come to Britain... Apart from the fact that Ministers have no power to tie the hands of Parliament, I can assure the House that no such pledge was given, either in public or in private." (Vol. 759, col. 1274. Date not known.)

"OF COURSE I AM FALLIBLE"

The *Daily Mail* of 29th November, 1972 carried an article by Mr. Walter Terry on an inside page. Headed, "Tory MPs in new race revolt" it described how Sir Peter Rawlinson had been cornered by some of his legal colleagues. Mr. Terry reported: "The row with Sir Peter burst at a crowded meeting of the Home Affairs Committee at Westminster and continued last night at a session of the Commonwealth and Foreign Affairs group. Sir Peter argued as he has done many times before: Britain is bound by international law to take in Uganda Asians. His embarrassment was acute when another noted lawyer, Sir John Foster — followed by several others — rose to say that this was nonsense. They quoted chunks of international law to disprove it. And they said if Asians were expelled by an African country this meant they should go to their 'country of origin' — India and Pakistan, mostly. (Emphasis added). Amid a lot of argument Sir Peter said, according to one source: 'Of course I am fallible.'"

No further major disclosures appeared until the 2nd February, 1973 when the *Daily Express* published another article by Chapman Pincher. Entitled "At last the truth about Amin's Asians", it continued:

"Another extraordinary admission about coloured immigration is made on behalf of the Foreign Office in the official report of the proceedings of Parliament published yesterday.

"Answering a question about the rights of Kenya Asians with UK passports to settle here, Mr. Anthony Kershaw stated: 'Their entitlement to enter this country is regulated by the Immigration Act 1971. International law is in general concerned with the rights and obligations of states rather than the rights of individuals. There are between 60,000 and 70,000 nationals of the UK in Kenya. Of this number about half are patrials of this country. The remainder have no right of abode here and are required to obtain entry clearances.'

"So now we have the final confession that the *Daily Express* and Mr. Enoch Powell were absolutely right when they insisted that Britain had no legal obligation under domestic or international law to let in the flood of Asians kicked out of Uganda by General Amin. Sir Alec Douglas-Home has already stated that there was no promise or obligation under British law.

Contd. overleaf

BATTLE OF THE STANDARDS

Reprinted with acknowledgements to CANDOUR, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants.

THERE is no more infallible sign of the pollution of society than the poisoning of the channels of public communication – a sign all the more deadly in that it is to these channels that people are encouraged to look for the central truth of any given situation. An army which goes into battle fed by false information, emanating all too often from the enemy's psychological warfare experts, is defeated before the first shot has been fired, and in the same way no community can live to useful purpose if its intelligence services are befouled.

From earliest times purveyors of public lies have always been active among mankind and it is impossible to think of any period when Great Britain was free of a Yellow Press or its equivalent. What renders public safeguards impossible today, however, is that not only the BBC but some of the most famous newspapers in our land have set aside the high standards which prevailed until the last couple of decades and replaced them by the malpractices of the cheapest and nastiest propaganda agencies ever to have beset our public life. The subject is of such enormous importance that it may be well worthwhile examining in depth one of the most blatant examples of this century – I refer to the grossly improper treatment given by *The Times* to reports of the alleged Wiriyaumu massacre in Mozambique.

Printing House Square began the wicked business by citing as its authority for the massacre a certain Father Adrian Hastings, who – so far from having had any direct connection with the alleged exposure – proved merely to have translated "evidence" by a group of Spanish priests, which *The Times* took at its face value and at this stage did not even trouble to check. The Reverend Father took full advantage of his days of glory by crossing the Atlantic and, under the auspices of the United Nations, appealing to the conscience of mankind. To say that his action was presumptuous suggests at least some kind of weight, whereas

Adrian Hastings, as revealed on television, was as dripping wet as the steaming jungle in which the massacre is said to have taken place. In fairness it should perhaps be added that he made up for lack of weight by a sense of continuity which not even the most daunting complexities were able to deflect. For instance, when it was established that no such place as Wiriyaumu could be found on the map, he was happy to accept in its place another place-name called William. In so doing, the fact that he had to make a descent to the gorgeously grotesque seems not only not to embarrass him, but not even to impinge upon his power of perception. His statement that all who had knowledge of Bantu languages were aware that the letters 'r' and 'l' were almost interchangeable struck at least one person conversant with two Bantu languages as an example of etymological clowning. I began to tell myself how the Matebere established themselves in what is now Southern Rhodesia and set up Burawayo as their capital; how of course the capital of Kenya could well be pronounced Nailobi; and how Lord Chelmsford defeated the Zulu armies of Cetewayo at the Battle of Urundi – thereby beginning a sort of personal parlour-game which kept my mind occupied for at least twenty minutes!

THE NUMBERS GAME

Nor did this little priestly lightweight rest his case on exotic generalisations about Bantu place names. Displaying a hardihood worthy of some better cause, he plunged almost to his eyebrows in his own special kind of numerology. Missionaries in the neighbourhood were alleged airily to have stated that they had 400 names of the victims of the outrage to which *The Times* had given so much publicity: the only difficulty seemed to be to prevail upon the priests to make the names known to the world at large. However, the undefeatable Father Hastings was able to give the impression of filling the hiatus by mentioning the number stated in the original report. I quote his words: "Within the group of immediate secondary witnesses was the writer of the Wiriyaumu report – in early January still in Tete. It was completed by January 6. As an historical document the report is intrinsically probable evidence: it is clear and extremely precise in its assertions as to place, date, names. The 130 names fit very well with what one could expect from a group or people in such a place. It is also extrinsically well-authenticated in Madrid, not just by one or another priest but by the collective authority of the Burgos Fathers including that of their Superior General. Several of the men now in Madrid were still in Mozambique in early 1973." Honest to goodness, could there possibly be a vaguer or more infantile method of arriving at the truth than by stating that sundry 130 names (which are not named) "fit very well with what one could expect from a group of people in such a place"? What this foolish Father may hold to be strong and convincing argument is not of the least importance, but how a newspaper of the reputation, however out-dated, of *The Times* can bring itself to expect its readership to

accept the credibility of such nonsense is a very real mystery.

The Times did not rely entirely upon priests with a palpable propaganda axe to grind, but made more extensive enquiries and also sent its own Southern Africa correspondent to the scene of non-action. I am surprised that the Portuguese authorities did not leave Mr. Michael Knipe in peace to get on with his own investigation, in that his attempt to serve two masters – *The Times* and the truth – produced some quite comic effects. His first despatch, sent off from Tete, stated that his visit to that key town "threw no immediate light on the massacre allegation." This was a blow struck on behalf of the truth, whereas the second part of that sentence, reading: "but it provided a vivid glimpse of the harsh realities of the war between the Portuguese Army and the Frelimo guerrillas" might be considered – although perhaps remotely – a blow struck in the cause of *The Times*.

NO SIGNS OF MASSACRE

His second despatch, also from Tete, although sent after a visit of inspection of the alleged massacre area, provided this illuminating and to any unbiased mind convincing statement of fact: "The Portuguese troops, after checking each settlement for mines, allowed us at will through the various huts and assisted us in digging wherever there was loose earth. We were unable to detect any signs of a massacre. According to Father Hastings, Wiriyaumu was first subjected to aerial bombardment before 400 people were slaughtered. At none of the sites we inspected did we see any sign of bombing, shooting or any other indication of violence other than the burning of the huts." Not of course that such direct evidence could be expected to have the least bearing on Father Hastings' compelling sense of rectitude. Or, for that matter, on the moral uprightness of the stance taken by Mr. William Rees-Mogg. However, the Portuguese government resolved for *The Times* all its difficulties by restricting the free movement of its special correspondent, playing much the same role as that of the Official Solicitor, whose appearance before the Industrial Court caused Harold Wilson wittily to remark that it was the nearest approach to Divine Intervention during the present century.

Then came for Printing House Square what at first appeared to be another breakthrough. Another pack of holy fathers discovered that a boy had escaped the "Wiriyaumu slaughter" and with a yelp of joy *The Times* gave this news item the full treatment. Even on its own the discovery warranted prominent headlines and within an incredibly short time the number of survivors had quintupled. If the names were ever published I failed to read them in that august newspaper, and in any event they might seem to amount to very small beer when placed alongside the figures of 400 produced by the priests and the other set of 130 produced by the most exquisitely Reverend Adrian Hastings. Be they never so skilful, it is impossible to imagine that any group of assassins would wipe out 400 people, or even 130, leaving as few as five to live to tell the tale. Even here we have not reached the final irony. It turned out that neither the boy nor the other survivors could be tracked to Wiriyaumu – they were tribesmen of the village of Chawola. Father Berenguer, who figured prominently in drawing up the report on which *The Times* based its story, told another of that newspaper's reporters that the original document upon which its entire story was based – involving the alleged annihilation of 400 villagers – relied for its contents not only on the supposed killings at Wiriyaumu, but included ten villages in the general area. It is thus seen that the reporting of the alleged atrocities was far enough substandard to be a disgrace to *The Times* newspaper and the general profession of journalism. One last incident must suffice. As long ago as July 17 a Spanish missionary in Madrid named a nun who was reported to have

ASIANS: THE GREAT DECEPTION

Contd. from previous page

"Why is the Government now making these coy admissions? The Government knew that it could not achieve its top priority, the Common Market legislation without the support of Labour MPs who were 'soft' on immigration. To avoid offending them, it decided that it must take a soft line itself until Britain was safely in Europe. So when the Amin crisis arose, Mr. Robert Carr, the Home Secretary, Sir Peter Rawlinson, the Attorney-General, and Sir Alec himself were required to state that Britain had an obligation under domestic and international law to take them in.

"Now a much harder line can be taken. And to justify it the legal truth is being quietly placed on record."

Deception? That's putting it mildly!

seen the results of the Wiriyaumu massacre. She was a Mother Lucia from the Basque country. We read with expectancy through the first twelve paragraphs of *The Times* report to ascertain precisely what it was that the nun had seen, and then came upon a solitary reference. I quote: "Perhaps for that reason a committee of observers was allowed to be formed and this committee flew over the area about a week later. Mother Lucia was aboard the helicopter." (Italics are mine.) Anybody who maintains that such reportage is not infamously crooked must possess a very depraved sense of values.

I have concentrated upon the Mozambique case, not because it is of any particular significance to Britain or to Anglo-Portuguese relations, but to illustrate in the clearest way that can be shown, the depth to which the so-called respectable press can sink in the course of habitually misinforming its readers. There have been in recent years dozens of indications of how *The Times* has cheapened and begrimed itself by refusing to act with a proper

sense of responsibility and not all the instances concern this *suggestio falsi* technique. One remembers how the paper's editor some years ago permitted himself to be flown by helicopter, in the company of various other moth-blown personalities in the political and religious fields, for the purpose of interviewing in the house of a Lord Lieutenant the greatly-exalted figure of Mick Jagger, who had been arrested on a trumpety charge of possessing half-a-dozen Driminyl tablets. The idea was to obtain the young gentleman's views on everything in heaven and on earth. The cheapness of the occasion was staggering. Much more recently the paper's coy little commentator, Bernard Levin, was allowed to describe in detail a hideously pornographic cartoon and to deny against all nature that it possessed any pornographic content whatever. Finally, one does not know quite what to make of a diary-writer, signing himself P.H.S., being allowed to write of himself: "Robin Haydon, the new spokesman for Heath, said he thought it beneath the dignity of an ace reporter like myself to be

writing such trivia about what suits Heath was wearing." This admittedly is only a small item, but the licence given to a journalist publicly to pat himself on the back and thus boost his own piffling ego reveals the extent to which traditional values are being progressively knocked down and replaced by sheer galloping conceit. It is but one of the many signs which help us to measure the extent of Britain's social and spiritual decadence. Unless we can secure for ourselves, and that rapidly, a general resurgence of the spirit we shall have nothing but inexhaustible misery to hand down to the generations to come. I wish to express here my firm conviction that when the perilous situation becomes more generally known, the superb British spirit will do more than rise to the occasion.

This article was written when the author knew he had only a short time to live. He died a few days after it was finished.

DAVID McCALDEN

RACE HATRED ALIVE AND WELL

RACE HATRED is being fomented in Britain by the rabid, vitriolic ravings of lunatics and extremists.

No, that isn't the comment of some demented liberal on the activities of the National Front, but the logical conclusion any thinking person would reach when confronted by the Black Panther newspaper, *Grass Roots*.

Grass Roots first came to the general public's attention when a member of its staff, one Antonio Soares, was arrested and charged with incitement to cause explosions and incitement to carry firearms. These charges arose from an article which appeared in *Grass Roots*, and a subsequent booklet entitled *Self Defense* which gave details of bomb construction and methods of urban guerilla warfare. The editor of the newspaper at that time, Abdullah Jamal, managed to avoid arrest, and fled the country for the safety of the East Harlem ghetto of New York City. Soares was found guilty and sentenced to 200 hours "community service" — despite the fact that in 1969 he was sentenced to two years' imprisonment for a similar charge of incitement to murder! Under the supervision of the Notting Hill Amenity Trust — a council-sponsored organisation which puts on Street Theatre, Steel Band competitions and "Greasy Trucker" pop concerts — Soares is still serving out his sentence, which consists of painting and decorating poor people's flats in the area. At weekends he runs a Black Panther book-stall in Portobello Road and in the evenings he helps out at the offices of *Race Today* — Britain's most anti-British white liberal magazine.

Since the police prosecution, the tone of *Grass Roots* has not mellowed, nor has that of its writers. Gus John, one of its contributors, recently caused uproar at the Lewisham Community Relations Council

A.G.M. when he told the delegates that as whites they should mind their own business and stop interfering with blacks; all whites were racists anyway. Two thirds of the delegates walked out, their liberal, patronising attitude to blacks severely dented. It is interesting here to note that Mr. John said the only reason he had condescended to come in the first place was because he was a close personal friend of the Community Relations Officer, Asquith Gibbs (a Communist Party member).

Neither does *Grass Roots* itself see eye to eye with the Community Relations Industry. Hackney and Harringey C.R.C.s have both made complaints about its damaging effect on community relations. *Grass Roots* returned the compliment by nicknaming the Hackney C.R.O., Jack Baksi — "A. K. A. Backside".

But it is when they give vent to their burning hate of "whitey" that the Panthers become offensive to the point of viciousness:

"I have read *Grass Roots* and have grown to hate the whites, especially those who are against you" — letters page.

"Black is one big happy nation;
Black is a colour that stands out.
When the world is recreated, black will be the colour dated.
Blacks will be the Empire makers;
Whites will be the shoe-shine makers."

— poem by 10 year old.

"We will not hesitate to kill or die for our Freedom. Seize the time! All Power to our People!" — *Self Defense* page.

"Black people are being persecuted and slung into jail for a number of trivial offenses. Justification for such action against the most oppressed and exploited people in the world is usually labelled as the maintenance of law and order. But let's face this law and order gag like it really is: whose law is being broken? Just for the record: it's

them blasted honkies."

— "Self Defense" page

However, to be fair, *Grass Roots* does occasionally talk a resemblance of sense. The Panthers are emphatically against race-mixing. They also deride middle-class American blacks who adopt white foster children — "They want to have this white girl around the house to prove to their white neighbours how white they are. He also wants to screw her as well." They are also scornful of Blacks who adopt white culture — "If you buy whitey's clothes, you automatically adopt his culture and habits. By doing this you become alienated from your own Black Roots."

Amidst the verbiage and childish tantrums, one can also come across useful snippets of information, which do not usually appear in the 'straight' press. In one edition of *Grass Roots* there was a detailed account of racial fights amongst our soldiers in Northern Ireland. In No. 8 there was a front page story concerning a military conference at Oxford, which Panthers had been 'duped' into attending, to formulate contingency plans on how the government should handle a Black uprising in this country. Each edition usually carries an article about corruption and incompetence in Caribbean governments. It is also worthwhile noting the contributors to the newspaper. "Jak", the well-known cartoonist, supplied a full page cartoon deriding and caricaturing the police.

Alas, all is not well with *Grass Roots*. Allegations 'circulated by the rumour-mongering department of Scotland Yard' that funds had been misused, led to the financial downfall of the newspaper. It is now doubtful whether it will continue in print. No doubt *Spearhead* readers will mourn this great loss to the British literary scene.

U.S Navy black thugs mug Dunoon

THE PEOPLE of the little Scottish town of Dunoon in Argyllshire have just had an unwelcome taste of what "Black Power" is all about. On Saturday 14th October gangs of Black sailors from the United States Navy depot ship USS *Canopus* raged through the town in a vicious race riot.

A lone Police sergeant was savagely beaten up, and a local youth was stabbed and severely wounded. Not content with this the Black mob assaulted a 13 year old girl. The mob then invaded and smashed up a pub and broke 22 shop windows in three streets and generally terrorised the population.

After the riot six U.S. sailors were arrested — all of them Black — and released on £25 bail. The rest of the Black sailors have now been confined on board their ship pending further Police enquiries. The six arrested sailors are accused of invading a public house, resisting arrest, presenting weapons, attempting to rescue a man in custody, wounding by stabbing, window smashing, assaulting a Police officer and assaulting a 13 year old girl.

Details of the nature of the assault on the 13 year old girl have been suppressed in reports which have appeared in the national press.

U.S. Navy Commander Albert Kellor and Captain Walter Brooks, who are officers connected with the Polaris squadron based in Dunoon are reported to be investigating the emergence of an organised Black Power movement among the Black ratings based in the town.

During incidents which led up to the rioting, Black ratings were reported to have given Black Power salutes and to have chanted Black Power slogans. Such conduct has greatly provoked the local population, taxing their traditional hospitality to the limit.

Due to the lax "appease-the-Black-at-all-costs" policy being implemented by American service chiefs, Black American servicemen in stations all over the globe have been allowed, in recent years, to wear their hair non-regulation 'Afro' style and to give to their superior officers Black Power rather than normal service salutes. In Dunoon Black servicemen are given permission to wander about the town dressed in bizarre pseudo-Afro garb.

The public relations spokesmen for the U.S. Navy in Scotland claim that the maintenance of good relations between the townspeople and the sailors is a "constantly

sustained exercise". They also claim that sailors selected for posting to Dunoon are of "the highest calibre available." While they say that Black sailors constitute "a minority" of the sailors on the base, they do not state how large that minority is, but they do admit that the number of Blacks posted to the station has increased of late.

It is well known that due to the policy of appeasing the Blacks in the American armed forces, large numbers of skilled White servicemen are quitting and the American Government is now forced to dredge the ghettos of America's urban slumland and recruit Black recruits who would otherwise drift from welfare offices to race riots to prisons. Some months ago a major race riot broke out on an American aircraft carrier and hundreds of Black ratings had to be expelled from the ship at gunpoint.

The recent riot is not the first of the crisis situations which Dunoon has had to cope with as a result of the Black infested U.S. Navy base. Since early 1963 the town was forced to open up a special V.D. clinic. No such clinic was required before the base opened. Then in 1971 the U.S. Navy authorities had to engage in a full-scale enquiry into drug-taking among sailors.

The events at Dunoon are a clear illustration of what happens to a fighting force with a proud tradition of valour and discipline when the multi-racialists get to work. The frightening thing is that the sailors at Dunoon are responsible for maintaining the Polaris nuclear rocket defence force.

Those people who advocate that the British armed services and the Police should be padded out with Black Immigrants should take note of the way American service institutions are declining into chaos and indiscipline simply and solely because of racial integration.

All patriots should read

CANDOUR

The British Views Letter

founded by

A.K. Chesterton

Published by Candour Publishing Co.

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants.

Central Fund

The National Front has launched a Central Fund for the purpose of meeting its administrative expenses in the fighting of the next General Election, in which it aims to put up 50 candidates. This fund is not to be confused with local branch funds.

Branch funds will aim to raise the required sum for the fighting of their constituency campaigns, i.e. the placing of candidates' deposits, the printing of their election literature and other general expenses.

The Central Fund is to cover the expense of administering the whole election campaign from headquarters and will include the extension of full time secretarial and organisational staff as its main item.

The Central Fund has been set a target of £10,000 a year for the next two years, starting from the 1st June 1973.

Contributions and pledges for the first year, 1973-4, have so far totalled £4,616.83.

We urge all supporters of the National Front to give generously so that we may raise the desired figure or at least get a substantial part of the way towards it. Contributions should be addressed to the National Front, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, CRO 2QF. Cheques or postal orders should be made out to National Front, No. 2 account.

SPEARHEAD FUND

It is now time to make appeals for the *Spearhead* Fund for the year 1974. Increased sales during 1973 led us to hope that we would be able to meet a greatly increased share of running costs during the next year out of normal income. These costs, however, have increased considerably during the past year. Paper prices have risen and we are promised two further 10 per-cent rises during 1974. In addition we now have a considerable item of extra cost in the folding, stapling and trimming of copies each month. This used to be done by a team at NF Headquarters but it has been found that this places such a burden on staff and voluntary workers and demands such an allocation of space that the whole of Headquarters work is disrupted for several days thereby. We have therefore had to negotiate with an outside company to get the work done for the future. This raises our costs during the year by approximately £500.

It is our desire, for as long as we can hold it, to keep the price per copy at 10p — because, among other reasons, it greatly simplifies our accounting procedure, the work of which is a great burden on staff preoccupied much of the time with other work for the National Front.

Our original target for the fund for 1973 was £350. Due to the unforeseen withdrawal of certain services, this later had to be increased to £530.

When expectation of increased sales during 1974 are balanced against increased costs, we estimate that the figure of £400 will be adequate as a target for the fund for that year. We are therefore appealing to our very loyal readers to help us raise this amount by their contributions. Some readers in past years have been kind enough to pledge sums of between £10 and £100 in advance towards this fund. We hope that some will find it possible to do the same this year also.

Otherwise small donations, of whatever amount, from any quarter will be gratefully welcomed.

SIMON HARDING

NORTHERN IRELAND: FERTILE SOIL FOR A LEFTIST SELL-OUT

IN 1955 France was struggling to maintain its authority over Algeria in the face of vicious terrorist activity on the part of communist-inspired guerillas. The French were not attempting to subjugate an alien people, but to integrate them into a French Union in which they would be democratically represented like any metropolitan region of France. The French Left, however, far from welcoming this internationalist and distinctly non-racialist policy, supported instead the Arab nationalist movement, the so-called National "Liberation" Front. (The reason for this is quite clear — all National Front members will be familiar with the ease with which "liberals" distinguish between white nationalism and black nationalism). Due to the incompetence and weakness of the government a situation was allowed to develop in Algiers where the entire Moslem quarter of the city, similar to the recent "no-go" areas of Northern Ireland, was controlled by F.L.N. terrorists. At this time General Salan, a veteran of Indo-China (Viet Nam) and experienced in counter-revolutionary warfare, was put in command of the French army, and under his direction paratroops were sent into the Moslem quarter to smash the terrorists. This they achieved swiftly and smoothly, virtually crushing overt resistance to French rule. This success for France had a profound effect on the liberals and leftists of that country.

Indignant at the crushing defeat inflicted on their Arab communist proteges they began to hurl accusations of brutality and torture at the French army, and especially at the paratroop regiments, many of whose officers had been subjected to torture and attempted brainwashing while in Viet Minh prison camps. Of course the paras had used torture, and, apart from the fact that the terrorists deserved nothing better, how could the French have got sufficient information to round up all the communist murderers without it? This, of course, is precisely why the ethno-masochist perverts of France objected to torture, because it was successful. Any stratagem which defeats a national enemy, according to white liberals, is completely intolerable, while the same stratagem used against one's own country is perfectly justified, especially if it is used by blacks, Asians or communists. Thus, when F.L.N. gangs murdered white civilians and blew up ambulances carrying wounded victims, not a murmur of protest was heard.

By 1958 elements of the French officer corps had become convinced that the politicians were about to sell out Algeria to the terrorists. Accordingly, when spontaneous riots broke out among the European population the generals sent an ultimatum to the government. Faced with determined opposition, the leftist establishment collapsed, making way for General de Gaulle, who, the army thought, would maintain French nationalist interests. However, this was not to be. Contaminated by the corruption and rot of present day party politics, de Gaulle sold out to the leftists and by 1962 Algeria was no longer French, nor was it a democracy.

Completely abandoned by the French government, there remained a white minority

of half a million in a population of eleven million. Did these people prosper under benevolent Arab rule? No, as in other black-ruled countries, the white minority was hounded and robbed out of existence. A great triumph, indeed, for the leftist intellectuals of France, whose humanitarian principles are extended to everyone except

members of their own race and nation. Before the last French soldier had departed Moslem gangs began to take over European property. Within a few months most of the white population had fled to France. Thus, another "people's democracy" was "liberated" from the "imperialists".

Those who are acquainted with events in Northern Ireland will not fail to draw the obvious analogy with the situation described above, with the exception that in Ulster the vast majority are thoroughly British and determined to remain so. However, Britain also is fighting against a ruthless, communist-supplied, minority terrorist organisation. Britain's security forces, too, are reviled by the Left, and accusations of brutality flow freely wherever a British soldier attempts to defend himself or protect innocent bystanders against hooligans and murderers. Britain, too, suffers from incompetent and weak politicians, whose only response to a problem is to call for an enquiry to see if it really exists or not, and meanwhile to criticise anyone who really tries to do something about it.

The conclusion to be drawn is obvious. Nationalists and patriots of all European and white-ruled countries must unite to combat the insidious influences of leftist and establishment cretins in order to ensure the continuation and lasting health of West European civilisations and the defeat of its enemies both at home and abroad. The only party in Britain with the energy, dynamism and **will** to achieve this result is the National Front.

How to obtain SPEARHEAD

Spearhead is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME

ADDRESS

IF OVERSEAS, SEALED OR UNSEALED

SURFACE MAIL OR AIR MAIL

RATES (12 issues):

British Isles: £1.56.

Overseas surface mail: £1.50 unsealed

£2.52 sealed

Overseas air mail: £2.94 Canada, U.S.A., S. America,

(unsealed) Africa, Middle East

£3.42 Australia, New Zealand,

Far East

Discounts can be obtained
for bulk purchases as follows:—

20—49 copies: 30 per-cent

50—99 copies: 40 per-cent

100—249 copies: 50 per-cent

250 copies and
over: 60 per-cent

PLEASE NOTE: These overseas rates apply as above if remittance is by international money order; if remittance is by cheque an additional charge of 25p applies, as our bankers require this as commission for the handling of all foreign cheques.

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to: 50 Pawns Road, Croydon, CRO 2QF, Surrey.

OLD PARTIES' TIME RUNNING OUT

The following is the text of the closing speech made by National Front Chairman John Tyndall to the NF annual conference in London on October 13th. It was originally our intention only to publish excerpts of the speech but in answer to a considerable demand we are featuring it in full.

Mr. Chairman, fellow members . . .

Soon this conference will be over, and we'll be going home for the weekend. When we pick up our papers tomorrow morning we will, if we're lucky, see perhaps two column-inches reference to the fact that the National Front held a meeting at Conway Hall. As far as the contents of this meeting are concerned, it's doubtful that there'll be a single reference.

Contrast this with the hundreds of thousands of words, column after column, page after page, that have been written about the conferences of the Conservative, Labour and Liberal parties — with every major speech, and every major theme, faithfully reported, and then analysed at length by all the so-called experts in the dailies and weeklies.

Yet it is this conference, and this conference alone, that has witnessed a really serious discussion of the great national issues that are troubling the electorate of this country. And it is this conference, and this conference alone, that has proposed anything fundamentally different and new to the policies by which this country has been misgoverned for the past quarter-century.

During the past three weeks I've been studying carefully the reports that have come, day by day, from Southport and Blackpool, looking in vain for the smallest glimmer of real statesmanship or leadership, looking in vain for any sign of awareness of the real nature of the cataclysmic crisis which faces this nation, looking in vain for any sign of a willingness on the part of anyone to rise above the cheap, brawling anti-heap of professional party politics, above the petty posturing and point-scoring, and to look squarely and forthrightly at the crucial issues of national survival.

To paraphrase an old French expression, the more these parties try to emphasise their differences, the more they look the same.

First we had the Liberals, basking in euphoria as a result of recent by-election successes and favourable opinion polls, trying to put across to the public the greatest confidence trick of the decade. I refer to the pretence that the Liberal Party offers a real alternative to the policies that have brought the other two big parties into the doghouse with the electorate. In fact on every issue that has lost the other parties votes, the Liberals offer a solution that is even more obnoxious to the people of this country than the solutions of Tory and Labour. It doesn't matter whether it's the Common Market, Immigration, the Economy, Education, Housing, Law and Order — there isn't a single idea that the Liberals have that commends itself on its own merits to that vast disillusioned section of the public that now looks for great change. The Liberals win their votes for one reason alone. Scarcely one elector in ten is serious minded enough about politics to really study the parties and find out what they intend to do.

In fact the Liberals are terrified at the prospect of their policies on the major issues being put under any real scrutiny. If they were, perhaps more than one in ten of the public would rumble them and reject them with contempt. So what do

they do? They gear up their whole propaganda apparatus to divert the attention of the public from the great issues of the nation and the world to the tiny issues of the parish pump. They send their snoopers to every little locality. They find out what are the little local grouses. — Are they grouses about sewage systems? Or zebra crossings? Or street lighting? Or refuse collection? Whatever the grouse is, the Liberals crawl ingratiatingly up to the grouse. Little shabby circulars come through the door — you've all seen them. We're your friends, they say. Whatever you're grouching about, we're on your side! This of course is the 'super-sell'; it bears all the marks of being the product of a Carnegie college of salesmanship. This is the package with which the Liberals are presently conning the nation; this is the great Liberal substitute for a real national policy!

"COMMUNITY POLITICS"

Along with this, the Liberals have introduced a new catch-phrase into the dictionary. Every year or so the old parties have to do this, and the phrases that they think up look as if they're entries for a competition in inanity. We had "Tory freedom works". That was replaced by "A better tomorrow". Then we had "Labour loves London". Now the Liberals have got a catch-phrase: they call it "Community-politics". I've been trying to find out for the last year just what "Community-politics" means. The other day a Liberal supporter tried to tell me. "It means involving the whole community in the great decisions that we have to make." "Fine," I said. "Does that mean that you're going to involve the whole community in deciding what to do about immigration? Are you going to let the whole community decide whether to bring back hanging? Are you going to let the whole community decide whether we stay in the Common Market?" Immediately I mentioned these things, I noticed a dramatic change in my Liberal friend's enthusiasm for the whole concept of "Community-politics". The mask dropped. Gone was that pretence of being a "friend of the people". In its place was the attitude that we all know — the attitude of the arrogant 'elitist', the intolerant, bigoted would-be organiser of other people's lives — the attitude of "we know best what's good for everybody". The real face of Liberalism!

So much for Liberal ideas. What sort of men and women have the Liberals got to offer the country? That's one of the troubles. I saw a shot of the party conference on television in which the cameras ranged right down the hall, showing the delegates in all their finery. In many cases it was difficult to tell who were the men and who were the women! Liberalism seems to have unleashed a new species on the Western world — a species whose sex is indeterminate. There seemed to be a great many of this species at Southport.

As for the rest? Well, I can only say that they looked like people at some gigantic seaside carnival. Smirking, giggling and swooning. Their reactions to the speeches of their leaders were rather like the reactions of children to a Punch-and-Judy show. Anything more remote from the real world of political and economic power, it's impossible to imagine. Such are the people who now come forward as the saviours of Britain in her moment of extreme national emergency!

A week later we had Labour. In this year's

conference — as perhaps in no conference since the war — the real soul of the Labour Party bared itself. We saw at Blackpool confirmation of what we have been saying about the Labour Party for years — that the real dominating force in that party is a group of people whose spiritual ancestors are Marx and Lenin — whose flag is not the British flag but the red flag — whose allegiance is not to the British people but to International Bolshevism.

What was the great formula that this conference produced to deal with Britain's problems? It amounted to nothing less than this — down with the best people in Britain, the most brainy people, the most hard working people, the most productive people, the people with the greatest enterprise and initiative, the people who make the wheels of industry turn, the people who supply the skills and sweat that give our economy what limited vigour it has. Down with them all! Soak them of their earnings even more than they're already soaked. That was the message of Denis Healey's proposals to slap massive tax increases on those earning £3,000 a year or more. Mr. Healey might have been trying to give the impression that all this was aimed at the wicked capitalists, the stock-exchange gamblers, the property speculators, the kings of the multi-national companies. But in fact that wasn't so. Those people have a hundred and one ways of dodging their tax liabilities. They can live abroad, move their capital about the world, put their profits into tax-free foundations, set up business organisations so complex that tens of thousands of pounds can just be written away in the books so that the tax-collector can never find it. No, Mr. Healey wasn't getting at those people. The people he was getting at were the ordinary wage-earners and small businessmen of this country. The ordinary working class and middle class with just that bit of extra energy and brains to climb above the rest. In fact there never was a time in history when it was more important to encourage just this section of the population. One of the reasons why British industry is behind its competitors is that they encourage their best workers and we don't, they give them incentives and we don't. What does Mr. Healey want to do? He wants to take the whole incentive out of the economy, out of life. He wants to drag down the very people who are the hope of Britain industrially and technologically. And to what purpose? to serve nothing other than the worn-out dogmas, prejudices, jealousies and resentments and hang-ups of his own Marxist ideology.

Not one single part of this has anything to do with the battle against inflation. It isn't going to accomplish a thing in the way of tackling the huge forces of international financial power that hold the British economy in its grip. Least of all is it going to overcome the laziness and downright inefficiency that are such a large part of our country's problems. On the contrary, it's just going to encourage them.

SHATTERING SILENCE

Delegates came to that Labour conference representing very largely the working class electorate in Britain's major industrial cities and towns. In the majority of those cities and towns, and most of all in the working class areas of them, there is a massive social problem caused by the existence of huge and increasing populations of coloured immigrants. Millions of the people who elected the Labour MPs or who voted for Labour candidates in those cities and towns are more concerned with this problem than perhaps any other national problem today. And yet I scanned all the reports of the conference in vain to read of a single peep of recognition of the problem by any senior delegate to the conference. The silence over the whole business was so shattering that you could hear it from one end of the country to the other. And these are the people who posture and strut around as the dearly beloved and dedicated representatives of the ordinary working people of

Britain. Have you ever seen such a fraud! Have you ever seen such a racket as this!!!

Finally, this week, we've had our basinful of Edward Heath. Mr. Heath, during this last year, has introduced yet another catch phrase into the jargon of politics in this country — a catch-phrase which perhaps lacks the ring of optimism of previous Tory catch-phrases. The phrase is "Don't let's lose our nerve!"

"Don't lose our nerve" has been the stock expression of Tory Government ministers for the last few months. One never quite knows, when they use it, whether they're talking to us or talking to themselves! What does "losing our nerve" mean? One would gather that it means disagreeing with the policies of Edward Heath's government and believing that they can't work! Well, that's a new one. In the Soviet Union anyone who disagrees with the Government is not just wrong — he's mad. It seems that in Britain anyone who disagrees with Edward Heath is "losing his nerve". What are we to do to show that we have good nerves? Why, follow Mr. Heath and support his policies!

Reading the reports from Blackpool this week one soon becomes aware that the conference is very much about 'phase three' of the Government's fight against inflation. Hardly a speech is made without reference to this 'phase three' of the anti-inflationary battle.

Listening to all this, I'm struck with wonderment. I wonder who the Government thinks it's kidding. When they say that they're now in 'phase three' of the battle against inflation, one would suppose that that means that phases one and two have been successfully negotiated. But have they? I don't see any letting up in inflation; it's as rampant as ever. What are we doing talking about 'phase three' when we haven't even carried out phase one? Listening to Mr. Heath talk like this, I get the picture of a general in battle. His armies are decimated by the enemy and retreating on all fronts. The enemy is besieging his last redoubt. The few troops he has are half way towards mutiny. So what does he do? He calls his staff together, gets out his maps and his charts, and says "Now, Gentlemen, we're going to plan phase three of our victorious attack!" I say again, who does the Government think it's kidding? Its whole policy against inflation is an utterly hopeless failure. It's been defeated on all fronts. It was bound to be defeated because the policy was founded in the first place on a completely false idea of what inflation is, what causes it. But instead of admitting that the policy is wrong, Mr. Heath tries to tell us that it's actually succeeding.

But we shouldn't be surprised if this Government lies to the people about inflation. After all, this Government's whole existence is based on lies. It lied its way into power at the last election. It lied about the Common Market. It lied about immigration control. It lied about its intention to have no incomes policy. Then it lied again about immigrants. It lied about our so-called 'legal obligations' to the Uganda Asians. It's now lying about figures of immigrants in schools. It's lying about the effect of the Common Market on prices of food. This is a Government of liars, fellow members, as well as a Government of traitors!

LET'S HAVE COURAGE

So these are the three alternatives that face the electorate of this country if they want to stick to the old parties, if they're afraid of having a real change. This is the dismal prospect facing Britain — if we don't have the courage to go for something new. Three parties, which between them over the past 70 years have dragged a great nation from the heights of splendour to the gutters of humiliation, chaos and backwardness; who chucked away an empire in the space of a single generation; who made the people who lead the industrial revolution the paupers of the modern world of

industry; the three parties whose leaders led us into the most disastrous war we ever had — shouting about the need to defend our national freedom — and then as soon as the war was over conspired to sell our national freedom down the river behind our backs! The leaders who led us into war talking about defending Britain from the foreigner — then as soon as the war was over imposed upon us the worst foreign invasion in history. These are the men and the parties for whom nearly the whole of the 20th Century has been a century of national failure. And now we see them — still appealing to the public to support the same old racket, still going back to the people and saying "give us another chance!" When one confidence trick wears thin, they produce another. When one of them becomes completely discredited, another one steps in and says "vote for us, we're different." But in the end they all turn out to be the same. Now the Tory and Labour confidence trick has worn out, what do they do? They build up the Liberals — as if the Liberals were anything new. In fact it was the Liberals that started the whole national rot. It was the Liberals who started the rot in the Empire. It was the Liberals who started the rot in Northern Ireland. It was the Liberals who started selling the British economy out to International Finance. The Liberals were chucked on the dust heap of politics half a century ago — for these very things! And now they come forward trying to tell us that the Liberals are an alternative to the parties that've been continuing selling out the nation where they left off!

What is this so-called 'Liberal revival'? My friends, this 'Liberal revival' is nothing more than a last desperate throwing of the dice by a bankrupt establishment, fighting for its miserable life against the scorn and the anger of the British people.

The establishment knows, with the mood of the nation as it now is, that a new force is going to arise in British politics — because the people demand it, and nothing can stop it. The so-called 'Liberal revival' is a frantic attempt to stem this demand by giving the people what looks like a new force but what is in fact just another arm of the old establishment under a different name.

Well, fellow members, this next few years is going to see the rise of a new force in British politics — but that new force will not be the Liberal Party; that new force will be the National Front! That is our message to the old parties from this conference.

A REAL ALTERNATIVE POLICY

This message that I give is not just idle speechmaking; it's backed up by a rate of new recruits flooding into our office at a faster rate than ever before. It's backed up by better election results than ever before. It's backed up by bigger and better marches and demonstrations than ever before, by a bigger flood of literature than ever before. It's backed up by more and better National Front branches than ever before!

In the next election, where we shall field at least 50 candidates in different parts of the country, we shall offer the British people for the first time in decades a real alternative policy. It won't just be old policies under new colours; it'll be the first new policy many voters have ever had, and it'll be the only new policy in the next election.

In the next election we shall offer the people of this country for the first time a party that is wholly committed against the Common Market. We're not interested in talking — as Labour is now talking — about 'renegotiating the terms' of the Common Market; we are pledged to get out of the Common Market — and stay out of the Common Market, and we will never, never, never go back on that pledge!

In the next election we shall offer the people of this country the only viable policy to deal with inflation. Everything that the other parties have said or done is just nibbling with the

problem. In the end they all admit that they can do very little because inflation is an international problem and they've tied Britain to the international economic system.

Our answer is that if Britain is tied to an international system that's causing prices to go up all the time then we must untie Britain from that system and build a national economic system in its place. We hear a lot in this party about the foreign invasion into this country — a foreign invasion of people; well, there's another foreign invasion that we're pledged to stop, and that's the foreign invasion of goods. We have the British market flooded with manufactured goods of every description which British resources and British skills could easily make. Successive governments have wilfully destroyed huge chunks of British industry to make way for these foreign products: aircraft, armaments, motorcycles, industrial machinery, ships, electrical goods, cameras. There's no reason on earth why British industry should not supply all we need of these things. This party is going to see to it that British industry is organised to produce these things for us and foreign products kept out.

MASTERS OF OUR OWN RESOURCES

We are going to give a deal to the British farmer which will give him first call on the whole British home food market for food. At the present time this country only produces half of what it eats. The public have been so misinformed on this subject that many people think that this is all we can produce from our own resources. That simply isn't true! This country could be cultivated to produce nearly all its own food. We don't do it because International Finance, which rules the British economy, makes bigger profits out of foreign trade. The vested interests which control Britain don't allow us to follow the policy which we could follow if we were masters of our own resources. When we've got out of the Common Market, which is the first priority, we'll be free of the so-called 'Common Agricultural Policy'. British produce will replace foreign produce, and for that part of our food which we have to import we'll give 100 per-cent preference to the White Commonwealth, which always was the best source of food from overseas.

This country can cut down drastically on imported raw materials by the development of North Sea oil. In the situation that's now developing with oil in the world, the North Sea reserves could give us enormous power. In the meantime the Government is doing its best to get rid of them. It's selling them out lock, stock and barrel to multi-national companies and it's negotiating with the Common Market to have them under joint control.

This party is pledged to ensure that the oil and gas of the North Sea come under British control, British ownership, for British use and for the profit of Britain — even if it takes the Royal Navy to do it!

And we won't stop at oil and gas. One of the biggest scandals of the past few years is the way that the industrial assets of Britain have been sold out to multi-national companies, and particularly the Americans. We're going to restore these assets of Britain to British ownership and keep them under British ownership. We are not going to tolerate a situation in which decisions affecting the livelihoods of millions of British workers are made in Detroit, New York, Tokyo or the Rhur.

The other great need in the battle against inflation is to control finance. One of the most absurd superstitions that has governed the economic life of this country for this century is the idea that finance determines the goods we can produce, the houses we can build and buy. Any sane approach to finance tells us the very reverse. Finance is only a token of resources and production. One of the big lies that the Tories have been telling us for

Contd. overleaf

OLD PARTIES' TIME RUNNING OUT

Contd. from previous page

many years is that the working man causes inflation by demanding higher wages. The fact is that inflation is caused by the international banks having the power to create credit out of all proportion to goods and resources — with no government having the courage to control them. We are pledged to bring the entire control of finance and credit under the nation — to be used for the good of the nation! We are pledged to see that finance becomes the servant of the national economy, and not the master of the national economy!

All the parties at Southport and Blackpool have spoken about social services. Of course all of them are vying with each other to offer the most attractive social service schemes to the electorate. Each of them tries to pretend to everybody that it's more humane than the other where social services are concerned. I don't doubt that some of the delegates of those parties are perfectly sincere when they climb the platform and parade their social consciences. I know equally well that many of them are utterly phoney — simply putting on a big act in order to get votes.

But of course at the end of it all the question has to be answered: how are better social services going to be paid for? Some party spokesmen ignore this question as if it didn't exist. The Labour Party at their recent conference did give an answer: it's going to be paid for by milking the most energetic and productive people in the country, the people who do most to create the national wealth. It's the old left-wing trick of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

We want to provide better social services just like anyone else. But we're not going to pay for it by taxing our most successful workers out of existence. That'll simply make the whole country the poorer — and the aged and the needy poorer with it. We shall pay for it by the very simple process of discriminating. We shall discriminate between the people whose families have lived in this country and worked for this country for generations — and the people who've been five minutes off the boat before they start queuing up at the welfare offices demanding their bounty. We will discriminate between the people who are permanent residents of this country and the people who, as far as we are concerned, are temporary guests. And if the guests don't like it — if they say that it's unjust and unfair, we shall simply reply to them: You chose to come here; we didn't ask you to come; and if you don't like the way this country treats you you know very well what to do!

There is another way in which we shall discriminate. Our present Government is now giving away nearly £300 million a year in so-called 'overseas aid'. It's pledged to increase this year-by-year, and in fact it has stated that its eventual aim is to step up overseas aid to £1 per-cent of total national product. Who is getting this aid? For the most part, people whose poverty is their own fault and who hardly show us an ounce of gratitude. They grab what we give them as if it's some God given right, and instead of thanking us they complain that it isn't more. Our pledge to the people of this country is that this madness is going to stop, and that all the aid which this country can give is going to be given to its own people: the old people, the war veterans, the disabled and the newly born.

Now of course there is an old cliché that's trotted out at every party conference and particularly the party conferences of the left, and that is that we can pay for more social services by cutting down on defence. This can always be relied upon to win votes. It also happens to be the height of irresponsibility, and it's something to which this party will not subscribe. This country does not spend too much on defence; it spends much too little. Its defences are today dangerously neglected. Our Navy is run down to a ridiculous size; our Army is stretched to the limit through

lack of troops; much of our defence equipment is out of date — and far too much of it is made abroad. All the chiefs of the services realise this; The politicians realise it. But the politicians haven't got the gumption, nor the sense of national responsibility, to face this issue with the public and tell the public that it must contribute more, not less, to the task of defending our country. Our job in this movement is not to pander to ignorance and cowardice and pacifism on this issue; it is to give a lead to the public and tell it the facts. Perhaps it's an unfashionable thing these days to remind the people of this country that they have duties as well as rights. Then we are going to do the unfashionable; we are going to make national defence what it should always be: a supreme duty.

Now no analysis of national issues is complete today without a reference to Northern Ireland. What we offer the people of Northern Ireland can be summed up in one word: loyalty. A loyalty on the part of Britain that is worthy of their loyalty to Britain. What we've got to do for a start is put an end to the absurd posture of a British Government trying to be neutral in the Northern Ireland conflict. We are not neutral in Northern Ireland; we are on the British side and against the anti-British side. The other parties have made the Northern Ireland issue ridiculously complicated. To us it's quite simple. The duty of Britain is to fight republicanism and destroy republicanism, not just violent republicanism — as represented by the I.R.A. — but republicanism in every shape and form. We must fight it on the streets; we must fight it in the council chambers; we must fight it in the press; we must fight it in the schools. Only when republicanism has been destroyed in Northern Ireland will people of different religions be able to live peacefully with one another.

And in the fight against republicanism there is one special obligation we have to the people of Northern Ireland: that is to get rid of the pretence that what happens in Northern Ireland is in any way the business of the people in Dublin. This calculated insult to our own loyal people of discussing their affairs with a hostile foreign government is a scandal and a disgrace that must be ended.

IMMIGRANT PROBLEM

There is not time this afternoon to deal with the many other issues which this party will face at the next General Election, but I must before ending deal with one.

This party is known to the public perhaps more than anything else as the party which is pledged to put an end to the immigrant problem in Britain. In the Conservative Party there are individual voices that have shown the courage to face this problem out in the open, and we commend them. But there is no other party that is wholeheartedly committed to stop further immigration and to send the immigrants home. I can say without fear of contradiction that the National Front has given the lead to this country from the very beginning in facing this problem. It is our work, over many years, to begin with in the face of hopeless ignorance and misunderstanding, and always in the face of bitter abuse from the mass media, that has created a climate of opinion in which it is now possible for leading men of the other parties to acknowledge the problem and to speak about it openly.

Only this last month we have had new disclosures about the growing magnitude of the immigrant problem in the maternity wards and in the schools of our crowded towns and cities. What is the answer of the politicians? The same as always — we must spend more money. More on special education services! Bigger and better race relations industry! More on the fight against discrimination — in jobs, in housing, and so on. Always tickling at the surface of the problem instead of tackling it at the source.

Well, as the country knows, or will soon find out, that isn't our way. Whatever the insults, whatever the screams of the press, whatever the odium of the trendy lefties of the opinion media, whatever the ignorance and apathy of the well to do who live in sheltered country areas far from the scene of race and all that it involves, we stand by our policy of complete repatriation of coloured immigrants — because our duty to this country permits no other solution!

Now we don't know whether the great test of our movement is going to come next year or the year after. It all depends on Mr. Heath's surveillance of the popularity polls. But one thing is not in doubt. From today there must be no let-up, no effort spared to build up our movement in readiness for the struggle.

We cannot win the next election, but we can make such an impact upon it that this country is left in no doubt as to who is the coming force of the future, the one alternative to a dying nation.

We don't have the size and the assets of the other parties — yet. We don't have their money. We don't have their press and their vested interests behind us. But we have one priceless thing that they have not — none of them. We have the finest workers and the greatest fighters of all the parties in the country. We have people willing to turn their whole lives over to the cause without reward. We also have unity — the unity that comes of dedication to great common faith. I've seen today — we all have — the hate that we engender in our enemies, a hate that the Tories never encounter. That hate is the surest sign of our success and our potential. When the sewers and the dregs of politics rise up against you, you know that you're on the way! I believe that the greatest cause of this hate is the fact that there has now arisen in Britain an absolutely hard core of people dedicated to building a new movement of the modern age, a movement that is radical, even revolutionary, and which shows the capacity to win millions of working people over from the stranglehold of the left. I end this meeting with a call of warning to Mr. Heath, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Thorpe: Make the most of the present. Make the most of your conferences. Make the most of your little postures on the public stage. Make the most of the applause and the adulation of your little hangers-on. Make the most of the cocktail parties and the handshakes of your friends in Europe. Make the most of the smiles and the blessings of big business that shine upon you. Make the most of it — because your time is running out. Over the horizon the people of Britain are gathering against you — in their thousands, soon in their hundreds of thousands, soon in their millions. Watch that horizon. Listen towards that horizon. Soon you'll hear the sound of marching columns. Soon you'll hear the sound of drums. Soon you'll see the flags and the banners — a skyline covered with red, white and blue. Massing against you, gentlemen of the old parties, is the spirit of a reborn race, of a great people whom you have humbled, whom you have degraded, whom you have deceived, whom you have betrayed. No longer will this great people listen to your promises, your phrases, your alibis, your lies. The British people are uniting, working, organising, planning, marching. The British people, in this movement, are going to rise up and take back their country, and by their deeds show to the world that the spirit and the genius of this race lives on — proud, defiant and unconquerable!

DISCO DANCE

Organised by North London NF
Friday November 16, 1973
8.00 p.m. — 12 midnight

Tickets £1 obtainable from Mrs. D. Painter
22 Alington St., Finsbury Park, London N.4
Tel: 01-272 5326

Exact location of event printed on tickets.

NF stages best ever party conference

What was by common consent the most successful party conference ever was held by the National Front at Conway Hall, London, on Saturday, October 13th.

The attendance at the end of the meeting was around 400 and the enthusiasm throughout the meeting was high.

Mr. Kingsley Read, Blackburn branch Chairman, who ably presided over the day's affairs, opened the meeting with an announcement as to recent election results for offices in the NF. The results of elections to the National Directorate, which this year took place by the new method of a postal vote, were published in last month's *Spearhead* and need not be repeated here. The other results announced were the elections by unanimous vote of the Directorate of John Tyndall as Chairman and Frank Clifford as Deputy Chairman of the NF for the coming year, and of the six members to serve on the Executive Council for the year. Apart from the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, who automatically serve on the Council by virtue of their offices, the four others elected were Martin Webster, Gordon Brown, Walter Barton and Kingsley Read.

There followed the announcements of elections of heads of the chief departments of the NF and these confirmed no change from the previous year. These department heads then gave their reports of the year's work.

John Tyndall made the report on behalf of the Branch Development Committee as its sole current representative on the National Directorate. He stressed that he was acting as the department head in a temporary capacity caused by the resignation for health reasons of Martin Vaux, who was head of the department for most of the year. Mr. Tyndall outlined the work done by the Branch Development Committee in starting new active groups of the NF in many parts of the country and in establishing more demanding standards for recognised branches. He paid tribute to the work done in this field by Peter Holland, who he said had borne the greater brunt of the duties of the department over the most recent part of the year.

Richard Lawson spoke on behalf of the National Front Students' Association, which obtained official recognition as a senior department as a result of its work during the year. Mr. Lawson stressed the important role played in the student campaign by the termly newspaper *Spark*. He outlined some of the difficulties of campaigning in left-dominated universities and mentioned some where small nationalist groups had been set up.

Gordon Brown reported on behalf of the Administration Department, and his speech was among the most interesting of the meeting. He related the great improvements in administration that had been made during the year, such as the introduction of an efficient addressing machine and index system, an altogether improved method for dispatching literature orders and a better procedure for the enrolment of the movement's rapid intake of new members. He mentioned also that a sign of the health of the movement was the vastly greater proportion of subscriptions that were paid up to date compared with a year previously.

Mr. Brown also spoke in his capacity as elections officer and outlined in detail the greatly improved election results of the NF during the year, giving particular attention to the by-elections in Uxbridge and West Bromwich and the impressive local election campaigns in many areas, particularly Leicester.

Martin Webster then spoke on behalf of the



J. KINGSLEY READ ADDRESSES THE MEETING

Activities Department. He spotlighted the major national activities during the year, including the great 1,500 strong Remembrance Day march last November; the anti-Common Market demonstration at Covent Garden during Edward Heath's 'Fanfare for Europe' campaign, which was very well attended considering that it was held in the depths of the winter; the two marches and meetings in Blackburn, also in the winter; the excellent march and meeting in Huddersfield in March of this year; the big march and meeting in London in July this year; finally the march and meeting in Nottingham in September which was well attended despite breakdowns in transport which prevented many members arriving.

Mr. Webster gave some attention to the state of fear that NF progress had induced in the political left and the frenzied attempts that left-wingers had made to attack and break up NF activities, culminating in the riot outside the meeting at the very moment that he was speaking.

Carl Lane, as treasurer, related the massive improvement that had been made in the movement's finances during the year and announced the opening of a new bank account in which monies

would be placed so as to earn interest during the coming year. He mentioned also the considerable increase in the business and assets of Nationalist Books, the movement's literature distribution agency.

John Tyndall spoke again in his more customary role as Chairman of the Policy Committee. He said that although the Committee had proceeded with its work during the year he was dissatisfied at the pace at which this had been achieved and he wanted to see a much faster pace develop. He stressed the difficulties involved in this due to the fact that the main 'brains' involved in policy-making work had many other responsibilities in the National Front or had demanding jobs outside politics. He mentioned two policy booklets that had been produced during the year: a question-and-answer booklet on the economy and a well documented booklet outlining the NF case for Britain's withdrawal from the Common Market. He promised that the Committee would shortly have another booklet on the White Commonwealth and a little later one on industrial relations. Sometime early in 1974 and well in time for the General

continued overleaf

NF
puts
Britain
First

The National Front is Britain's fastest-growing party which says: "Put Britain and the British people first!". It is the true voice of the British people. Its main policies have been proved by one opinion poll after another to represent the views of the great majority of the British people. Find out more about the National Front by completing this form and sending it to: *The Secretary, National Front, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon CRO 2QF, Surrey. (Tel. 01-684 3730)*

Name

Address

.....
.....

The National Front needs money. It needs the funds to print leaflets, pamphlets and posters, to fight elections, to mount demonstrations, to organise the biggest patriotic movement in Britain.

So invest in your country's future. Send a donation to the National Front Fighting Fund today. It will be money well spent.

NF to fight Hove by-election

A war hero is to stand as the National Front candidate in the forthcoming Parliamentary by-election at Hove, Sussex. He is Squadron Leader John Harrison-Broadley, D.F.C., who is 52 years of age.

Squadron Leader Harrison-Broadley has been a member of the National Front for more than a year, and is an active member of the very strong Hounslow Branch of the Party. He was for many years an active supporter of the Conservative Party, but broke off all association with it as a result of the Conservative Government's policies concerning the Common Market, Coloured Immigration and inflation. "The Conservative Government has shown itself unwilling to conserve our national sovereignty and our ethnic identity, and unable to conserve the pound in our pockets," he says.

John Harrison-Broadley joined the R.A.F. in 1938, was qualified as a pilot and commissioned. At the outbreak of the Second World War he was posted to a bomber squadron. In 1941 he was shot down whilst operating against an enemy convoy in the Mediterranean. It was as a result of this incident that he was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross. He had been Mentioned in Despatches previously. He was a prisoner of war until May, 1945.

After the war Squadron Leader Harrison-Broadley took a short break from the R.A.F., devoting 1946 to private family business. From 1947 to 1950 he became Assistant Trainer to the well-known racehorse trainer Captain R. Laye. He rejoined the R.A.F. in 1950 and in 1951 was appointed a Flight Commander of a unit of Air Signallers. In 1952 he was posted to the Middle East where he acted as A.D.C. to the then Vice



Sqn.Ldr. HARRISON-BROADLEY

Chief of Air Staff, Air Chief Marshal Sir Arthur Sanders, and was later temporary A.D.C. to the then Secretary of State for Air, Lord de Lisle and Dudley.

From 1954 until 1956 he was Flight Commander in a Bomber Aircrew Training Squadron. In 1956 he flew the Task Force Commander to Australia for the Atomic tests, and took a leading part in those operations, being responsible

to Sir William Penney for the crater and radiological surveys and for all aspects of aircrew training. During this period he also acted as personal pilot to the late Lady Mountbatten on her visits to the Australian outback.

In 1957 Squadron Leader Harrison-Broadley completed a course at the Officers Advanced Training School and then became responsible for all aspects of the training of 240 apprentices at the No. 1 School of Technical Training at R.A.F. Halton. In 1959 he returned to "confidential flying duties" with R.A.F. Signals Command, covering the Arctic, European and Middle East areas. From 1961 until 1963, when he retired, he was Senior Operations Officer at a 'V' Bomber station.

Apart from racing, he is keenly interested in winter sports. He won the British bobsleigh championships in 1948 and came second in the European championships in the same year. His wife, Audrey, shares his political and sporting interests, and is also a very keen supporter of the National Front, and is greatly looking forward to helping her husband with his election campaign at Hove.

The National Front is planning a vigorous campaign in support of the candidate. Shop premises in the middle of Portslade — an important part of the constituency — have already been secured. The address is: 86 Station Road, Portslade, Sussex. The premises are two minutes walk from the Portslade and West Hove Station. The telephone number is 0273 411428.

All NF supporters living in the South East of England, and even beyond, will be welcome as helpers in the campaign and are urged to ring the campaign office for details.

NF PARTY CONFERENCE

continued from previous page

Election the Committee planned to produce booklets on housing, education and environmental matters. Mr. Tyndall also mentioned the great success that had been achieved by the new and larger policy statement that had been produced during the year. Mr. Tyndall acknowledged the contribution of Andrew Coniam to the work of the Committee.

Mr. Tyndall also reported on the work of the Publicity Department which for the moment had become incorporated under the Policy Committee. Here he paid credit to the work done by Peter McMenemie. He also announced the recent formation of a Display Department, whose workers had produced an excellent display of flags and banners for the meeting, and the new NF Film Unit.

There followed the longest part of the day's proceedings, which was the debating of motions put to the conference. Here it turned out that the time was inadequate to do full justice to the motions. Time given to each motion was strictly limited and in the end the last two motions on the agenda had to be eliminated from the conference with the promise that they would be introduced in a future bulletin.

The first resolution on the agenda, proposed by Martin Webster and seconded by John Tyndall, was that the conference should formally adopt the new constitution sent out to members through the post earlier in the year. In this the major amendment to the old constitution was that voting for the National Directorate should be by post instead of at an annual conference. This resolution was carried.

A resolution proposed by NF prospective candidate for Wolverhampton N.E., Tony Webber and seconded by Graham Jones of the Wolverhampton branch called upon the meeting to support all captive nations fighting to be free from Communist tyranny. This was carried.

A resolution by the same proposer and second

der moved that the NF should give tax credits to small firms battling against large conglomerate companies. While the sentiment of the meeting was in support of such small firms, the specific policy of tax credit was opposed and the resolution defeated.

Thomas Benford of Hounslow branch, seconded by Ken Robinson of Enfield, proposed a resolution calling for much stronger measures against the IRA. This was carried overwhelmingly.

John Tyndall, seconded by Gordon Brown, moved a resolution that the conference should give a mandate to the Directorate to negotiate, at its discretion, official working alliances with loyalist movements in Northern Ireland. This was carried.

A resolution proposed by Martin Webster and seconded by Henry Lord of Haringey called for an all-out effort by the NF to expose the fraudulence of the Liberal Party claim to provide a genuine alternative to Tory and Labour. This was carried.

A resolution proposed by John Tyndall and seconded by Martin Webster attacked the Government for selling out Britain's North Sea oil interests to foreign control. This was carried.

A resolution proposed by Henry Lord and seconded by John Fairhurst of Hayes attacked discrimination by the Government in favour of immigrants in social services, housing and education. This was carried.

Walter Barton, Chairman of the Northern Regional Council, proposed a resolution calling upon the NF to hound the authorities harder than ever in attacking its open door policy towards immigrants. The resolution, seconded by John Fairhurst, was carried.

Joan Sandland, of HQ staff and Lewisham branch, proposed a resolution deploring Government neglect of Britain's old folk and calling for greater efforts of the NF to campaign on their behalf. The resolution was seconded by Walter Barton and carried.

A resolution put by L. W. Adams and seconded by J. Dickenson called for a housing tax to replace the present rating system. This was defeated.

Because of lack of time two resolutions had

to be deleted from the agenda. The conference ruled that these can, if desired, be put through a future members' bulletin or in *Spearhead*.

There then followed what is always one of the most pleasurable parts of NF conferences, the awards of merit for the previous year. This year so many had been the claims for awards that in addition to the giving out of ten gold badges — the customary award — the Directorate had decided to give honourable mentions to seventeen other members who had done enough to normally earn a badge but who had been just edged out by the top ten.

Gold badges were presented by the Party Chairman to: Bert Clark (Herts.); John Fairhurst (Hayes); Richard Franklin (Harrow); Norman Mear (Huddersfield); Mrs. Sandra M'Kenzie (Manchester); Mrs. Pat Mussi (Richmond); Tony Nile (Hounslow); Geoff Parker (Bromley); Joan Sandland (Nat. HQ); and Ron Silverwood (Leicester).

Honourable mentions were then made of the work of: Eddie Adamson (Blackburn); Mrs. Beryl Brakes (Leicester); Andrew Coniam (Beaconsfield); Bill Fitt (Norwich); Philip Gannaway (Bristol); Fred Hynd (Hounslow); Mrs. J. B. Jones (West Bromwich); Henry Lord (Haringey); Peter Marsh (Hayes); Paul Mason (Camden); Paul Michel (Wolverhampton); Mrs. Jo Read (Hounslow); Ken Robinson (Enfield); Ken Sanders (Leicester); David Smith (Dover); Jim Turner (Bexley); and Russell Webb (Redbridge).

The next item was the appeal for the collection. This time, due to a stirring appeal by Martin Webster and the magnificent generosity of the audience, a staggering £1.245 was raised — easily an all time record.

There then followed the Chairman's closing speech. This speech has been reproduced in its entirety elsewhere in this issue. It ended in a standing ovation.

The meeting then closed with the singing of the National Anthem. Afterwards an enjoyable social was held above a public house a couple of miles away.